DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 524 UD 012 470

AUTHOR	Soles, Stanley
TITLE	Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1970-1971 Auxiliary Educational Career Unit. ESEA Title I.
INSTITUTION	Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	78p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Career Change; Career Ladders; Compensatory Education Programs; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Program Evaluation; School Aides; Supervisory Training; Teacher Aides; *Teacher Education; Technical Assistance; Vocational Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program; ESEA Title I Programs; New York City

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit, funded under Title I of the 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act, were: (1) to upgrade the basic skills of Education Assistants; (2) to administer and to coordinate a training program for staff trainers of paraprofessionals, Educational Assistants, and Associates; (3) to provide practicums and seminars for 750 Educational Assistants in community colleges; (4) to prepare and disseminate training guides for Educational Assistants; (5) to provide technical assistance and consultation services to other programs utilizing paraprofessionals; and, (6) to administer the comprehensive career program for 750 paraprofessionals, including inservice training, college enrollment, and promotional opportunities. Interviews, observations analysis of records, and documents were made as part of the evaluation procedure, as well as questionnaire surveys of the Educational Assistants, Educational Associates, District Training Coordinators, Auxiliary Trainers, and others. Twenty-five of the 31 school districts of New York City supplied data from the questionnaires used in the study. A random sample of 348 Educational Assistants and Associates were administered the questionnaire by the District Training Coordinators in each School District. (Author/JM)

ED 066524

FUNCTION # 910606

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE

1970 - 1971

AUXILIARY EDUCATIONAL CAREER UNIT

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1970-71 school year.

UD 012470

TEACHING & LEARNING
RESEARCH CORP.

355 Lexington Avenue/New York, New York 10017/212-490-0197

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The information in this study could not have been compiled without the cooperation of a number of persons. The Educational Associates and Educational Assistants were the ones who provided a series of responses to questions about the program and its operation in the schools.

The college coordinators of the training for paraprofessionals, the District training teams staff, coordinators, auxiliary trainers, and the other staff in District Offices were cooperative in providing essential information and opinions about the program.

The Director of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit, Mr. Gladstone Atwell, and the Assistant Director, Mr. David Smith, cooperated in providing information about the work of the unit and its functions. Other members of the AECU staff were of further assistance.

The Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education of the City of New York, Dr. Samuel D. McClelland, Acting Director and Dr. George Forlano, Acting Assistant Director, were of help in securing approval and clearance for the instruments used in the study and in other ways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
Table of Contents		i
List of Tables		ii
Executive Summary		iii
Chapter I	Description of the Program	1
Chapter II	Strategy and Model of the Evaluation 1970-71	6
Chapter III	Findings	
	Recommendations of 1969-70 Evaluation	
	Description of the Sample	13
	Objective "A"--Basic Skills Programs	15
	Objective "B"--Training of Trainers Programs	19
	Objective "C"--Inservice Training Programs	20
	Objective "D"--Dissemination of Information and Training Guides	22
	Objective "E"--Functions of AECU: Technical Assistance and Consultation	24
	Objective "F"--Career Ladder Program	26
	Objective "G"--Work-Study Program Elements	29
	Objective "H"--Performance of Paraprofessionals	35
	Objective "I"--Job Satisfaction and Training Program	38
	Objective "J"--Districts' Utilization of AECU	39
	AECU as a Unit of the Board of Education	
Chapter IV	Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations	42
	Review of Findings	42
	Issues Behind the Issues	43
	Conclusions	48
	Recommendations	48
Appendices		53
References		65

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Objective A

I School Districts Responding to Questionnaire by Borough 13

II Evaluation Objectives and Sources for Data 14

Objective C

III Paraprofessional Performance in College Courses 20

Objective D

IV Dissemination of Training Guides by Borough 23

Objective F

V Identification of Three Aspects of the Career Ladder Program 27

VI Career Ladder Program by Borough 27

Objective G

VII College Credits Completed by July 1971 29

VIII Year Expected to Start Senior College 30

IX Senior Colleges Participants Expect to Attend 32

Objective H

X Increase in Paraprofessionals' Responsibilities 36

XI New Classroom Duties in Brooklyn, Manhattan and Queens 36

Objective I

XII Job Satisfaction and Training 38

Objective J

XIII Number and Types of AECU Training Programs 1970-71 40

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU) is a unit in the Central office of Personnel of the Board of Education of the City of New York. AECU was established to develop training plans and handle personnel matters for newly developing para-professional programs. New York City began an auxiliary personnel program in 1967-68, and developed a career ladder idea for Educational Assistants. In the fallout from the 1968 work stoppage, and 1969 decentralization law, changes in the role of AECU took place. In 1969-70 as a result of decentralization, District Training Teams were organized with autonomy to devise their own training. AECU shifted to more of an advisory role. By 1970-71 functions for AECU were for four major areas: (1) direct training was reduced to providing training of trainers (a) Institutes (b) Boroughwide conference and (c) basic skills programs; (2) AECU has continued to provide technical assistance and consultation services in connection with para-professional programs; (3) AECU has served clearinghouse and dissemination functions; (4) AECU served personnel and administrative functions by reviewing, monitoring and certifying that personnel in prog am as authorized by guidelines, and contracts.

The objectives for AECU:

1. To upgrade the basic skills of Education Assistants.
2. To administer and to coordinate a training program for staff trainers of para-professionals, Educational Assistants and Associates.
3. To provide practicums and seminars for 750 Educational Assistants in community colleges.
4. To prepare and disseminate training guides for Educational Assistants.
5. To provide technical assistance and consultation services to other programs utilizing para-professionals.
6. To administer the comprehensive career program for 750 para-professionals including the inservice training, college enrollment and promotional opportunities.

The ten evaluation objectives constitute a model that combines outcome of program objectives and procedural objectives or processes. The model combines: (1) four evaluation objectives that are concerned with outcomes from basic skills, training trainers, inservice training, and dissemination and (2) six evaluation objectives concerned with processes such as consultation and technical assistance; career ladder; work study; performance change of para-professionals; job satisfaction and training; increase in utlization of AECU.

Methods Procedures and Sources: Interviews, observations analysis of records and documents, were made and questionnaires were given to Educational Assistants, Educational Associates, District Training Coordinators, Auxiliary Trainers and others.

Sample

Twenty-five of the thirty-one school districts of New York City supplied data from the questionnaires used in the study. A random sample of Educational

Assistants and Educational Associates were administered the questionnaire by the District Training Coordinators in each School District. There were 348 completed questionnaires. Another version of the basic questionnaire was designed for District Trainers, Auxiliary Trainers and Supervisors. There were twenty-six responses from District offices.

Evaluation Objectives and Findings from the Study

A brief statement of each evaluation objective and behavioral criterion will be stated, then the results of findings will be reported. The results show that the criteria established prior to the study were reached or surpassed for seven of ten objectives. The supportive evidence was not unanimous, but indicative of complexity of the problems, growth on the part of participants and difficulties that remain to be resolved.

Objective A - The objective was to assess the effectiveness of the various basic skills programs.

Findings: A number of basic skills programs were instituted. At one point the study was to check on participants progress toward a high school diploma, but since all had diplomas, the criterion was dropped as irrelevant. Basic skills programs were included in institute and workshops. These indicated both progress and resistance. One systematic basic skills program was rejected by a number of districts, and used on a pilot basis by one District. Results showed approval by 92 percent of participants. Objective standardized achievement or gain scores of participants, only self-rating by participants. The need to find other ways to upgrade basic skills continues.

Objective B - The AECU program for training the trainers of para-professionals was assessed by written questionnaire and interview with District Trainers. Sixty percent of the District Trainers were expected to be able to identify basic objectives of the training of trainers program, and 60 percent to regard the training as beneficial and useful.

Findings: The AECU program of training for District Trainers was rated by the participants as "helpful" by 70 percent of the respondents, or above the criterion of 60 percent. Only 30 percent could identify all three training of trainer objectives.

Objective C - was to assess the ongoing inservice program through the school district and community college for the 750 Educational Assistants. The behavioral criterion from a random sample of para-professionals would be able to identify the inservice training program objectives. From the records of the community colleges a criterion of 80 percent should receive a grade "C" or better by July 1971, in seminar and practicum.

Findings: Data from many sources were combined. Sixty-five percent selected the three basic objectives of the inservice training program; this was below the criterion of 80%. Data from the community colleges for Spring semester seminar and practicum indicated that more than 80 percent got grades of "C" or better. The existence of the mechanism and network for inservice training is an important support structure to be further utilized.

Objective D - The evaluation objective is to assess whether curriculum, materials and training guides have been prepared and disseminated to Educational Assistants. The behavior criterion used is that having identified guides, sixty percent should indicate that they are useful.

Findings: The dissemination and use of training guides by the Educational Assistants was to be found "useful" by 60 percent findings revealed that few knew about AECU materials and guides even though 5,000 copies of Newsletter "Paraphrase" were printed and distributed widely. Few gave AECU credit for the publications only one fifth of the Educational Assistants replied however of those who had received publications 98 percent said that they were useful! District levels did not fare much better than AECU in dissemination of materials. More research on dissemination and curriculum and training guides is needed. The remaining six evaluation objectives relate to processes that may combine both product and procedures.

Objective E - The technical assistance and consultation service were assessed by asking recipients of programs what services have been performed.

Findings: Information was gathered to indicate that AECU is indeed carrying out a series of technical assistance and consultation functions as claimed. AECU has lessened the confusion in New York City regarding para-professional programs. AECU is one place where some resource information regarding para-professional programs may be found. Many new duties and program services have been added by the Board to AECU staff responsibilities. A considerable portion of the time is devoted to monitoring, cerftifying and determining eligibilty, resolving conflicts and other personnel matters. These are facilitative, but not substantive to the para-professional training programs. Other personnel units within the New York City Board of Education or within Community School Districts or the State Department of Education could carry out the eligibility determination, review of personnel forms,etc.

Objective F - The operation of the comprehensive career ladder program was assessed. The behavioral criterion was that 80% of the Educational Assistants should be able to identify the three major aspects of the program; inservice training; part-time college study; graded steps in duties and pay.

Findings: Indicated that 60 percent of Educational Assistants were able to identify all three main parts of the career ladder program.

Objective G - was to assess the work-study program for the 750 Educational Assistants. Major issues of work-study included in the evaluation are matriculation, release time, articulation and attitudes. Educational Associates, college coordinators and district coordinators provided the evidence.

Findings: The work-study elements of the career ladder cover a range of issues, and a set overlapping jurisdictions. Findings revealed that "release time" to attend community colleges is working rather well. Limited, but important data, was gathered on where participants are attending, how many units taken, what senior colleges they expect to attend, and other matters. Results show that participants attend and expect to continue in colleges near where they live and work. Not being able to get required courses at times available produces frustration as did other factors. In the squeeze for time among teaching school; attending college; and time for the family; it is the family that is neglected, "sacrificed," or "changes" while mother gets the degree. Fear that problems of matriculation and articulation will eliminate the career ladder program persists; especially during the confusion of registration and in the transition from junior to senior colleges. The motivation commitment, and determination are strong. The sentiments expressed reflect the high purpose of the participants in becoming teachers who will enable children to learn better, and thereby to serve the school and the community.

Objective H - The evaluation of the performance of the para-professionals was to find out if they have improved and taken on new duties since last year. A behavior criterion was posited that 70 percent of the para-professionals would be rated as to have improved their performance.

Findings: The data used combined many sources to reveal that 85 percent of principals and 50 percent of teachers or an average of 65 percent are doing more challenging work, and are being given more significant work this year than in the past.

Data from the questionnaire used in the investigation revealed that the major effect of the program that clearly emerges from the data is the continued growth of central teaching functions on the part of the Educational Assistants and Associates this year. Sixty-two percent of "New duties and tasks" consists in working with children in presenting information and conducting recitation in small groups (43%) and through tutorial (11%) while 8 percent of the time to the class as a whole. The fact that 54 percent of the time Educational Assistants are increasingly working with small groups or tutoring may have an effect upon both the climate of the classroom and the learning of children. Further research as to pupil gains with or without para-professionals ought to be encouraged.

Objective I - The evaluation objective of work concerned satisfaction due to the training program. The behavioral criterion was that 60 percent of the training assistants were expected to be satisfied with the training program.

Findings: It was posited that 60 percent of the respondents would state that their own personal satisfaction on the job was due to the training that they had received. Results showed 90 percent of the respondents found that the training was either definitely helpful (66%) or helpful to some extent (24%).

Objective J - The evaluation objective was to assess the degree to which there has been an increase voluntary utilization of AECU by the Community School District Training teams compared to last year. The behavior criterion of gain is 30 percent increase in services by Districts.

Findings showed ten more districts than last year were served this year on regular basis, or fifty percent increase up from 20 to 30 districts. More districts sent representatives to training of trainers institutes and conferences regularly, but AECU had a smaller staff and relied upon consultation. The Districts conducted many more program services themselves this year.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

The findings revealed that 7 of the 10 behavioral criteria for performance were met or surpassed. The findings are tied in with issues from the larger structure that have effects upon the operation of para-professional and other programs. These issues behind the issues are the general crisis to crisis operation; the fiscal crisis; the partial decentralization; the crisis of educational leadership; and the need for more alternative approaches to program development and evaluation. In the context of these issues and the findings, the conclusions of the evaluation are:

The AECU is carrying the functions that it claimed. There are basic skills programs; the training of trainers; the district inservice training; community college courses; the dissemination of information and training guides. There is a cadre of Educational Assistants and Educational Associates moving toward full teaching status. They are completing work at the community colleges and under the work study program and plan to continue in the senior colleges.

The Recommendations made on the basis of findings analysis of the issues are: Chiefly that the existing mechanism for the career ladder program be continued but substantively strengthened and expanded. The Career Ladder program ought to be continued; the work-study elements be maintained; the training of trainers and the District inservice training be continued, but drastically strengthened. Lastly, it is recommended that a task force be formed in a coalition of interested groups in behalf of pin-pointing issues and making recommendations for the series of paraprofessional programs.

CHAPTER I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The basic strategy of evaluation and model of this study combines outcome objectives and process objectives. The evaluation is interrelated with program objectives and the functions of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit. Before describing the evaluation model in detail, the background and context for the Auxiliary Educational programs and program objectives for the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU) will be presented.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT FOR PROGRAMS AND AUXILIARY EDUCATIONAL CAREER UNIT

The basic rationale for the programs combines the following: (1) manpower needs; (2) delivery of services; and (3) new patterns of training.

In recent years there has been a shortage of teachers and a high turnover rate among many of the roles in education and human services. At the time, it was calculated that teacher shortage could not possibly be overcome by means of the regular four-year college avenue for the training of teachers. In part, to meet this need, a series of programs with paraprofessionals were devised and carried out. They became a part of the New Careers Movement in the 60's. On the basis of findings from a series of demonstration studies, it was found that indigenous workers from the community could make a positive contribution in working with disadvantaged children.[1] Their similar background enabled them to reach the children. They not only had a "job," but performed needed services in the classroom. They were able to deliver important services in the human service fields such as teacher aides, or health aides, or police-community aides, and other roles. Therefore, they not only carried out services, but were employed in new roles in manpower. Their contributions were not only to themselves and the economy through their job, but also socially through providing needed human services.

This approach constituted a new avenue for the development of staff, and new patterns of training. A series of programs were devised in the United States to meet the manpower shortage of trained personnel by creating new entry level jobs in the human services, but with training built into the job.

The inclusion of training built-into-the-job was a key step to provide the development by the non-professional of additional skills, while beginning the work of assisting the teachers. The concept of the career ladder added provisions for a series of steps in the program. These included formal education to further develop competencies on the part of these new personnel in the program. This enabled paraprofessionals to carry out more responsibilities while also gaining experience and training.

---

[1] Riessman, Frank and Gartner, Alan. "Paraprofessionals: The Effects On Children's Learning," Urban Review, Vol. 4, No. 2, Oct., 1969, pp.21-22. and Alan Gartner, Paraprofessionals and Their Performance, N.Y. Praeger, 1971.

The paradigm of the program is an alternative route for the development of personnel through experience-related training to help to carry out roles and to provide needed human services. It is an alternative to teacher-training patterns. This concept was outlined in New Careers for the Poor.[2] Many program variations have been developed with the core ideas of the career ladder added to the jobs with training built-into the job and opportunity for additional formal education. These programs for paraprofessionals were designed, therefore, not only as a way to provide services and jobs (manpower), but as an alternative route for some to an educational degree and professional status.

Multiple Institutions In Program

In New York City, there are a number of agencies, institutions, organizations, and groups involved in one or another phase of the program. The paraprofessionals must not only deal with the responsibilities of their own personal and family life, but also with the many other institutional relationships that impinge upon their many roles in the Auxiliary Personnel Career programs. A few of these institutional relationships are: (1) Classroom and school within the district; (2) Union or other bargaining agency; (3) Community and senior colleges of the City University of New York for formal course work in higher education; (4) Human Resources Administration for funding; and (5) Auxiliary Educational Career Unit and District Office in coordinating, certifying, and delivering services.

The point is that the paraprofessional must carry out a number of roles that are required among these various agencies and organizations in proceeding through the Career Ladder aspects of the program. There are issues and procedures within each of the above agencies and groups that affect the progress of the paraprofessional in the program.

Complex Program in New York City

New York City has had larger and more complicated programs than many of the other programs in the United States. For more than a decade the New York City schools have used auxiliary personnel (non-professionals) as volunteers, tutors, escorts, resource people, community-school aides, and other roles. Beginning in 1957-58, the School Aide Program provided auxiliary personnel to relieve teachers of non-teaching chores. The launching of the Head Start program in the Summer of 1965 led to the employment of auxiliary personnel in the summer and later in the full year pre-kindergarten classes as Teacher Aides, Assistant Teachers, Educational Assistants, and in other roles.

Auxiliary Educational Career Unit: Origin and Changes

In 1967 the Board of Education established an Auxiliary Educational Career Unit within the office of Personnel to centrally administer and coordinate an Educational Career Program. It has the responsibility for developing training and guidelines for the recruitment, selection, and use of Educational Assistants. Community participation was assured in the recruitment and screening process of local residents through the local community action agencies (CAA). The auxiliary personnel were recruited,

---

[2]Pearl, Arthur and Riessman, Frank. New York, Free Press, 1965.

hired, and trained in the Kindergarten program and other aide roles around the public schools located in low income areas. The program was a joint enterprise with the Board of Education, Human Resource Agencies and the City University. Some funds would enable the personnel to take college courses, especially through the community colleges, necessary to an Associate of Arts Degree in Teacher Education. In this setting, the AECU sought to devise many centralized functions relating to establishing the program and training.

In the context of events in 1968-69, including such events as the work stoppage or school strike, and the shift toward decentralization, the AECU sought to anticipate the shift in responsibility and moved toward training at the district-wide level. The Kindergarten program was continued and broadened to include auxiliary personnel for the First and Second grades. The funds for the program came from federal funds under PL 89-10 that provided for training and use of auxiliary personnel, and from New York State Urban Education PL 4536 that provided for auxiliary personnel to work in the classroom under the general supervision of licensed or certified teachers. The number of auxiliary personnel increased with each succeeding year. Under the decentralization law, training costs were shared by Central Board of Education and respective districts using funds.

AECU-Coordination Among Decentralized Districts

The Auxiliary Educational Career Unit provided a series of field services with a field staff working with the District Office and the Central Office of AECU. In 1970, with budget cuts, the field operations were cut. This change for AECU has meant a shift away from a centralized office with field staff to a smaller centralized service unit which assists the districts in the implementation of the respective decentralization Paraprofessional Training Programs.

AECU-Coordination of Services Among Many Programs

In 1970-71, the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit served a number of functions for the Board of Education of the City of New York. These functions were carried out for a number of programs in addition to the Early Childhood Program with the Career Ladder and Career Training Programs. The functions include:

. . . Providing personnel functions
. . . Screening applicants and determining eligibility
. . . Designing inservice training
. . . Providing training for trainers of paraprofessionals
. . . Certifying and verifying that program guidelines are followed
. . . Providing interagency consultation for school district, unions, and universities for the New York City Board of Education
. . . Disseminating information about programs and training
. . . Administering and coordinating personnel, program and career training programs

These services and others were provided not only for the Career Ladder and Career Training Program, but also for other programs such as Career Opportunities Program, Urban-Rural Program, and Veterans Services. Two of the programs are connected with Model Cities programs in New York City. The Veterans Services

Program is a cooperative program for field placement in New York City schools of veterans who are graduate students in education.

The focus of this investigation is upon the Career Ladder and Career Training Program of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit. Other studies may undertake a further evaluation of the entire range of programs and services of AECU. Ongoing studies are being carried out on the actual performance of the paraprofessionals.

Description and Objectives of Auxiliary Educational Career Unit Program for the Career Ladder and Career Training Program

The Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU) is a centralized service unit for the Board of Education which assists the districts in the implementation of their own respective decentralized Paraprofessional Training Programs. This is the fourth year of the program in which there are some 750 educational assistants assigned to grades K-2. The participating paraprofessional receives employment, inservice training, on the job training, possible joint training with the assigned teacher, and is eligible to take college courses for credit leading to a degree. The direct training program work of the AECU has been reduced, but there are the following training programs: (1) Boroughwide; (2) Institutes; and (3) Basic Skills. The inservice training is carried out through the Training Coordinators within each district and the respective district training teams for training twice a month. Basic curriculum has been developed by the AECU and the district training teams.

The AECU has functioned to provide services on a voluntary basis in response to requests for programs and services from the districts. It has few direct service functions. It serves the decentralized districts. Each district must purchase its own materials, but may call on AECU. AECU has a dissemination of information function regarding the program for paraprofessionals, curriculum, and through a new bulletin called "Ladder" or "Para-Phrase." It thus could serve as a clearinghouse among districts and other institutions that touch the program. As a clearinghouse, it could provide information, regulation, and coordination of funded programs, union programs, personnel recruitment, and other information. AECU also serves as a monitor of the various programs. It monitors for the City by certifying the eligibility of personnel in the program. A series of new functions has emerged in the functioning of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit operating under decentralization. To some extent these functions were a part of the previous operation, but they may have increased in extent and intensity of service.

Objectives of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU)

The basic program objectives for AECU are as follows:

1. To upgrade the basic skills of Educational Assistants.
2. To administer and coordinate a program for staff trainers of paraprofessionals.
3. To hold a training program for 750 Educational Assistants, consisting of practicums and seminars.
4. To prepare and disseminate training guides for Educational Assistants.
5. To provide technical assistance and consultation services to other programs utilizing paraprofessionals.

6. To administer a comprehensive career program for a delineated group of paraprofessionals (750 Kindergarten Educational Assistants) including inservice training, college enrollment, and promotional opportunities.

CHAPTER II: STRATEGY AND MODEL OF EVALUATION FOR 1970-1971

The evaluation strategy for the AECU for 1970-71 constitutes a mixture of evaluation of program results and evaluations of procedural objectives. The evaluation will deal with both products and processes. This evaluation is in contrast with aspects of the previous evaluations and seems judicious in light of the current phase and priorities of the program.

Prior years' evaluations were carried out by the New York University Center for Field Research and School Services. The evaluations for 1968 and 1969 were directed toward assessment of program objectives or results or outcome of the program of Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU).[3] The 1969 study dealt with program objectives for auxiliary paraprofessionals for third grade classes.[4] The evaluation for 1969-70 emphasized a series of procedural objectives and assessed the comparative reactions of personnel from schools affiliated with AECU and other school personnel from schools not affiliated with AECU.[5]

Evaluation Strategy

The current evaluation will focus around the functioning of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit, not the entire program, it emphasizes the operation of the Career Ladder and Career Training for Paraprofessionals. The evaluation objectives pertain specifically to the respective program objectives for the AECU as stated. The current evaluation is built upon the experiences and findings from the previous evaluations and current program priorities. It will include an analysis of the degree to which various recommendations from prior evaluations have been carried out. There is little need to repeat the same objectives for evaluation for the program as were assessed last year, except where such objectives are crucial to the ongoing program for this year and to follow.

---

[3] "An Evaluation of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit Program," New York City Title I Project Center for Field Research and School Services, New York University, August, 1970.

[4] "An Evaluation of a Program for the Utilization of Education Assistants in Selected Classes in Grade 3 in Special Service Schools," August, 1969, and "Evaluation of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit Program," October, 1969, both New York City Title I Projects from the Center for Field Research and School Services, School of Education, New York University.

[5] "Evaluation of the Program for Recruitment, Training, and Employment of Auxiliary Non-Professionals Neighborhood Personnel for Careers in New York City Schools," New York City Title I Project Center for Field Research and School Services, School of Education, New York University, 1968.

Model of Evaluation: Products and Process Objectives

The evaluation objectives constitute a model that combines outcome or program objectives and procedural objectives or concerns. This model combines product and process objectives. They may be listed as follows:

I. Products:
   A. Basic Skills Training Program
   B. Program for Training Trainers of Paraprofessionals
   C. Training Program for Paraprofessionals
   D. Development and Dissemination of Curriculum and Training Guides

II. Products and Processes
   E. Consultation and Technical Assistance by AECU
   F. Comprehensive Career Ladder Program for Educational Assistants
   G. Work-Study Program
   H. Performance of Paraprofessionals
   I. Increase in Job Satisfaction from Training
   J. Utilization of Central Unit by Districts

Evaluation Objectives

The first four evaluation objectives are concerned with the products or outcome of the program objectives:

Objective "A" -- Basic Skills Training Program

The evaluation objective is to assess the extent to which the Basic Skills Training Program has been effective. One proposed behavioral criterion was that 75% of all Educational Assistants enrolled in the training program would have passed their High School Equivalency Exam by the end of the school year in June, 1971.

It soon became apparent that all participants had high school diplomas. Therefore, attention was centered around other basic skills needed by participants in the Career Ladder Program.

Objective "B" -- Program for Training Trainers of Paraprofessionals

The evaluation objective was to assess whether there is an ongoing training program for paraprofessional trainers. One behavioral criterion used was that all paraprofessional trainers receiving training should be able to identify objectives of the training program and 60% should indicate that they find this training beneficial and useful. From a questionnaire, the trainers of paraprofessionals were expected to be able to identify written objectives and estimate the degree of benefit of each to the training program.

Objective "C" -- Training Program of the 750 Educational Assistants and Associates in Early Childhood Education Program

The evaluation objective was to assess whether there is an ongoing training program for the 750 Educational Assistants consisting of practicums and seminars. The behavior criterion of a random sample of

paraprofessionals should be able to identify objectives of the training program. Eighty percent should receive a grade of "C" or better by the end of the program in June, 1971, as revealed by the records of the CUNY community colleges.

Objective "D" -- Curriculum, Materials, and Training Guides

The evaluation objective was to assess whether training guides have been prepared and disseminated to Educational Assistants. One behavioral criterion used was that Educational Assistants should be able to identify training guides, and 60% should indicate that they were useful. The extent of the curriculum materials' and training guides' development and distribution was assessed from a number of units: AECU, the District Training Coordinators, Auxiliary Trainers, and others.

The remaining evaluation objectives are either process or a combination of both product and process objectives.

Objective "E" -- Consultation and Technical Assistance by AECU

The evaluation objective was to assess whether the Career Unit provides consultation services and technical assistance to other programs utilizing paraprofessionals. A behavioral criterion used here was to ask the AECU Project Director and other staff to specifically identify types and frequencies of cases in which they have provided technical assistance and consultation functions. In addition, District Coordinators and others were asked to estimate the degree to which they use AECU for technical assistance and consultation.

Objective "F" -- Comprehensive Career Ladder Program for Educational Assistants

The evaluation objective was to assess whether there is an operational comprehensive career program for 750 Educational Assistants (K-2). The behavioral criterion used was that 80% of a sample of Educational Assistants should be able to identify the three key aspects of the program: inservice training, college enrollment, and career promotion opportunities. The Educational Assistants were expected to indicate their responses in the written questionnaire administered by the Training Coordinator.

Objective "G" -- Work-Study Program

The evaluation objective was to assess whether a work-study program for the 750 Educational Assistants had been developed. A series of more precise behavioral indicators of this objective were devised to deal with different phases of the program among the various units and groups responsible.

Objective "H" -- Performance of the Paraprofessionals

While not central to the evaluation of the AECU, this evaluation objective was to assess whether the classroom performance of the paraprofessionals

has improved since last year. A behavioral indicator consisted of a response to a written questionnaire by a 70% sample of field supervisors and others. Data regarding the performance of the paraprofessional in the classroom was gathered from additional sources.

Objective "I" -- Increase in Job Satisfaction from Training

The evaluation objective was to assess whether the training program enables the paraprofessionals to get greater personal satisfaction from their work. The behavioral indicator consisted of responses to a written questionnaire by a 60% sample of paraprofessionals administered through the District Training Coordinators and the Auxiliary Trainers to indicate the degree to which the training program helped in gaining more personal satisfaction from the work. Data was gathered from other sources as well.

Objective "J" -- Utilization of Central Unit by Districts

The evaluation objective was to assess the degree to which there has been an increase in the voluntary utilization of the Community District Training teams as compared with last year. The behavioral criterion used was a standard of 30% increase in uses of the central Auxiliary Educational Career Unit as compared to last year. District records and personnel were consulted as well as information from the AECU.

Sources for the Data

A number of sources were consulted in gathering the data in line with evaluation objectives. These sources included the staff of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit: the Director, Mr. Gladstone Atwell; the Assistant Director, Mr. David Smith; and others. The AECU staff provided information about the history, background, and current operations of the variety of programs of the AECU within the Board of Education.

Assessment was carried out at the school district level by contact with the various District Training Teams throughout the City. The District Training Teams consisted of Training Coordinators, Auxiliary Trainers, and others. In addition, Educational Assistants, Educational Associates, and classroom teachers were interviewed and their opinions solicited.

Since the career training program is interlinked with advanced education through the community and senior colleges of the City University of New York, personnel involved in these programs were consulted. The college coordinators for paraprofessional training were of special help in this study.

Much of the information about the functions of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit was found in records and documents in the headquarters office and the various school district offices.

Methods and Procedures

In order to gather the data that would provide answers to the questions of the evaluation, a series of methods were utilized. The methods used direct field site visits by the investigator to a range of events and activities in

the training program combined with a series of interviews with select personnel carrying out different functions in the training program.

In the main, detailed analysis of the records and documents and previous evaluations of the program, its changes and functions, provided a basis for construction of the main plan for the evaluation. One phase consisted of visits to ongoing programs in each Borough and interviews with participants to revise views of the program gleaned from the reading of documents. Another phase of the evaluation procedures was the development of an administered questionnaire for the District Training Coordinators and the Auxiliary Trainers. A second version of the questionnaire was devised for the District Trainers to administer to a sample of the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates in their respective school districts. (For a copy of the questionnaire, see Appendix B.)

Interviews were held with District Training Coordinators following the use of the questionnaire to secure their reactions. The sample of field supervisors of the paraprofessionals provided some additional impressions as to the functions of AECU and its functioning in the overall scheme. College coordinators provided another source of information. It was through both interviews and responses to the questionnaire that their opinions about the program were sought.

Statistical and Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative analysis of the findings was used to determine the extent that each behavioral criterion set prior to the study was met. This study does not involve complex statistical analysis, but relied upon the percentage of the responses obtained for each of the behavioral outcomes in line with criteria or standards for performance established prior to the study. These figures will be supplemented by the appropriate graphic and tabular materials.

Modification in Evaluation Design

Since the 1970-71 evaluation design was developed prior to viewing the 1969-70 evaluation, a few appropriate changes in the 1970-71 evaluation design were made in the light of the current stage of the programs. This avoided duplication and allowed for more significant issues that had emerged to be assessed. In the light of the additional information about the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU), the previous evaluations of the program and the current stage of the program, a number of things emerged. The original evaluation plan as submitted stands with some slight shift in priorities. The evaluation objectives 1970-71 were concerned with various outcomes or products and various processes and procedures that were carried out. The model for evaluation included both types of objectives.

Priorities of Evaluation Objectives

During 1970-71, the key personnel in the program rated "work-study" as a top-priority objective (Objective "G"). The "commitment to the career ladder" by the Board of Education and the City University would also be very important (Objectives "F" and "C"), and sufficient power and "support for the role of AECU" to deal with the new functions that have emerged by the Board and the districts would rate third (Objective "E"). The other

objectives follow in importance, but are not critical as are the above three.

Slight Modifications in Design Priorities

Each respective objective in this evaluation will be assessed in more than one way with more than one type of measure, when appropriate. The goal of upgrading basic skills was pursued in a number of ways this year. One behavioral criterion for Objective "A" was that 75% of those who took the high school equivalency examination would pass. This criterion was dropped since all the participants in this program already had high school diplomas. The Basic Skills programs were carried out through Borough-wide meetings, through institutes, and through a sub-contract to the Human Research Laboratory (HRL).

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

The results of the 1970-71 study may be viewed in the perspective of the previous 1969-70 evaluation made by the New York University evaluation team. Prior to the presentation of the findings from the 1970-71 evaluation, a brief overview of the recommendations and conclusions of 1969-70 will be noted. Comparisons with 1970-71 findings will be made in Chapter IV: Conclusions and Recommendations.

Recommendations of the 1969-70 Evaluation Team

The recommendations made by the New York University evaluation team concerned the following areas:

> clarification of commitment to career program; the role of AECU; the career ladder idea; joint training; orientation; preservice and inservice training; parent-school linkage; salary increments; and dissemination of the evaluation.

Of the nine recommendations, the first three dealt with policy clarification, and the role of AECU and Career Ladder. These three matters are central to the program for the 1970-71 evaluation objectives of AECU (Objectives "E" and "J"), Career Ladder (Objective "F") and work-study (Objective "G").

There were four evaluation recommendations that dealt with "training": joint, orientation, preservice, and inservice training. These recommendations in turn pertain to current evaluation objectives regarding the training program (Objectives "A," "B" and "C") and the performance and satisfaction of paraprofessionals (Objectives "H" and "I"). The other recommendations dealt with aspects of the program which are not central to this year's evaluation. Slight changes in priorities of the evaluation design were made to take into account the stage of the program in 1970-71.

The highlights of recommendations from the 1969-70 evaluation provide a chart of where the program was at that point. The first three recommendations are the most crucial to the objectives of the 1970-71 program: i.e. long-term commitment to the program; clarifying the AECU role under conditions of decentralization; the concept of the career ladder, especially in terms of its relevance to the work-study phase of the AECU program. The 1969-70 recommendations provide a picture of the stage and direction of the program one year ago. Further comparisons will be made of 1969-70 and 1970-71 in Chapter IV: Conclusions and Recommendations.

Description of the Sample

In each of the thirty-one school districts in New York City there is a small district training staff where the inservice training of the paraprofessionals is planned and implemented. From twenty-five of the thirty-one school districts of New York City data was gathered from the questionnaires used in the study. A random sample of Educational Assistants and Educational Associates were given the questionnaires by the Training Coordinators in each of these school districts.

There were two versions of the basic questionnaire. One questionnaire was designed for Educational Assistants and Associates, another version was designed for District Trainers, Auxiliary Trainers and Supervisors. (For a copy of the questionnaire, see Appendix B.) The questionnaires had previously been reviewed with each District Training Coordinator.

Eleven district training officers responded to the survey. There were twenty-six respondents including the Auxiliary Trainers from the various districts. A total of 348 questionnaries were completed. They were distributed as follows:

143 from school districts in Brooklyn
87 from school districts in Queens
86 from school districts in Manhattan
32 from school districts in Bronx

The responses to the questionnaire were received from the following school districts:

TABLE I. School Districts Responding to Questionnaire by Borough

BOROUGH	SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Manhattan	1, 3, 4, 5
Bronx	7, 9, 10, 11, 12
Brooklyn (Kings Co.)	13, 14, 15, 17, 18
Queens	24, 27, 28, 29, 30

Findings for 1970-71 Evaluation

The information for the findings results from data gathered from sources listed earlier in the report consisting of interviews with AECU staff, school district training staff, and staff from the City University of New York involved in paraprofessional training programs. The presentation of findings combines the data gathered from documents, records, and interviews with the data from the questionnaires used in the study.

An overview of the evaluation objectives and the sources for data may be listed as follows.

TABLE II. Evaluation Objectives and Sources for Data

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	SOURCES FOR DATA			
	Items On Questionnaire	Documents and Records	Interviews	Observations Field Site Visits
A. Basic Skills Training Program	8-15	X	X	X
B. Program for Training Trainers of Paraprofessionals	17-18	X	X	X
C. Training Program for Paraprofessionals	19	X	X	X
D. Development and Dissemination of Training Guides	20	X	X	
E. Consultation and Technical Assistance by AECU	21	X	X	X
F. Comprehensive Career Ladder Program for Educational Assistants	6	X	X	X
G. Work-Study Program	22 27-32	X	X	X
H. Performance of Paraprofessionals	7	X	X	X
I. Increase in Job Satisfaction from Training	16	X	X	
J. Utilization of Central Unit by Districts	20, 21, 32	X	X	X

The findings of the 1970-71 study are presented in line with each evaluation objective in a straight-forward manner. Brief restatement of each evaluation objective will be followed by a summary statement of the evidence regarding the achievement of that objective as gathered from documents, records, interviews, observations, and the data from questionnaires.

Objective "A" The effectiveness of the basic skills training program was to be assessed. Information was gathered from a variety of sources in addition to the questionnaire. The proposed behavior criterion that 75% of those in the basic skills course in preparation for the High School Equivalency Examination would pass the examination. As noted above in this report, since all of the participants have high school diplomas, the criterion for passing the exam was irrelevant. Although information on the high school basic skills program was gathered through questionnaire Item 9, it is not reported.

More Basic Skills After the High School Diploma

The fact that participants had high school diplomas did not mean that further work on basic skills was unnecessary. The goal of upgrading basic skills was approached in a number of ways. Basic skills programs were provided through Borough-wide meetings, through special institutes, and through a sub-contract for a pilot program. In the questionnaire, Items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 dealt with various aspects of the basic skills development programs.

Items 8 and 9 dealt with whether participants were taking basic skills programs and were expecting to take the High School Equivalency Examination respectively.

Item 8 indicated that many of the participants had some type of work in basic skills. These programs and inservice training were provided increasingly in 1970-71. Nearly twice as many took some type of program in basic skills in 1971 than had in the previous year.

Item 8 results were:

Year	Participants
1967	11
1968	26
1969	22
1970	26
1971	45

Items 10, 11, and 12 from the questionnaire all dealt with the program in basic skills that was offered to all districts but continued on a pilot basis in only one district. The overall responses to Items 10, 11, and 12 indicated that the program was not widely known. However, additional data from forty respondents from District 9 who participated in the program by HRL showed that 92% said that the HRL materials were either "excellent" or "a good idea" (37 of 40), while only three respondents stated that they were "undecided" about the program. Using data from #12, eighty percent of the respondents selected either that "a great deal of help" (for "a" - 28 of 51 or 55%) or "a good deal" (for "b" - 17 of 51 or 33%.)

The results of evaluation of HRL by School District 9 were as follows:

	Useful	Other Comments
Spelling	32	8
Spanish Conversation	35	5
Reading K-2 Grades	32	-
New Math	25	5
Sompsec	33	4
Countee Cullen Library	35	3

Most Useful Training	Number
Sompsec	12
New Math	8
Reading	5
Spelling	4
Countee Cullen Library	4

Least Useful Training	Number
Spelling	6
Countee Cullen Library	4
Spanish	4
Math	2

More Training Needed In:	Number
Math	9
Spanish	7
Field Trips	5
Reading	1

The results of the evaluation in School District 9 indicate that of the forty-two participants who responded to the evaluation of the pilot program, thirty-two or 76% found it extremely valuable. Among the "experienced" staff from the sixty-six respondents, comments were 80% favorable (fifty-two favorable, thirteen unfavorable, and one no response) regarding the training program.

Questions on the HRL basic skills course are indicated as follows:

10. One of the series of courses in basic skills was presented to some of the career development participants in an AECU workshop or institute by Human Research Laboratory in the Fall of 1970. Did you attend?

11. If "yes" to #10, have you continued to take some of the instructional materials or exercises in basic skills or self-instruction that were provided by Human Research Laboratories?

12. If "yes" to #11, what has been your reaction to the materials and to the HRL program?

		N	%
a) The materials and the program are excellent, have improved my skills a great deal and are very helpful in teaching.	a	28	55
b) The program and materials are a good idea, but they vary from one skill to another in effectiveness and use in the classroom.	b	17	33

		N	%
c) At first the purpose of the program was unclear, but now that we are in it I am finding that it is of value, but it is too early to tell about results.	c	6	8.5
d) The program and the material is too complicated and does not deal with the problems of greatest priority from my viewpoint.		--	--
e) Neither the program nor material is of any use.		--	--

Additional information on the pilot course in basic skills in District 9 revealed that two components were used in the nine-week course: vocabulary building and spelling. There was an increase in enrollment from the original thirty-eight to 128 who took the course as the program went along. This is the opposite of "drop-outs" from programs. Results reported that 250 new words were introduced, or twenty-four new words per week, with 94% overall retention. Two hundred fifteen difficult spelling words were introduced with an overall level of 92% accuracy attained. The pre- and post-evaluation constitute an increase in overall achievement as measured by the Davis Reading Achievement Test.

College Instructors, Graduate Students Assist in Basic Skills

One feature that met with approval in the various basic skills programs was the use of college instructors and graduate students to aid remediation along with school units. Items 13 and 14 in the questionnaire sought to secure opinions from Training Assistants and Associates about the program. As with other programs, not all areas of New York City had the program, but where such programs were offered, 62% of the respondents found the program services of great help and ways to use the services were found. Another 30% found the service a good idea and some skills more helpful than others. Only three respondents, or less than 6%, found the program or service just getting started.

Items 13 and 14 are as follows:

13. The help in basic skills has been provided by college instructors and graduate students with specialization in reading and other areas for some school districts. Have you had some training services provided in your school or district from City University of New York?

14. If "yes" to #13, then pick <u>one</u> alternative that reflects your estimate:

		N	%
a) The services provided by college instructors and/or graduate students are of great help to us here and we have found ways to use these services.	a	27	55

---

[6]This information on the two components was supplied the investigator by Human Research Laboratories who conducted the program.

		N	%
b) The service is a good idea; it is helpful in some skills more so than others.	b	16	32%
c) It is too early to tell; the program and services are just getting started.	c	4	8.2
d) The idea means well, but the college instructors and/or graduate students have not been able to fit into the on-going program in the schools yet.	d	2	4.1
e) We have had the services long enough to realize that this is not what we need or want.			

Variety of Basic Skills Programs, Variety of Reactions

The endorsement for the HRL program in basic skills was not universal. When the program was first offered to the various District Training Teams, many rejected the approach and, following an orientation program, decided not to continue. The pilot HRL program with School District 9 in the Bronx had 128 participants and from the sample of respondents reported here, it appears to have worked out rather well. It must be noted that gain scores or achievement scores of the participants were cited, and self-ratings by the participants.

Interviews revealed one possible interpretation of the general initial reaction to the HRL program in basic skills was a concern that the para-professionals had been singled out for "testings." The HRL approach called for need assessment prior to programming in basic skills. The HRL program called for individually prescribed instruction based upon need. One reaction suggested was that programmed instruction was resisted since it lacked concern for the whole human being. Some members of the pilot group who participated in the HRL program were defensive and uneasy about the initial diagnostic "testing." The final evaluation showed that the participants were able to overcome this resistance and to gain competence in basic skills.

Borough-Wide Training of Trainers in Basic Skills

The AECU staff took into account the resistance to the HRL program by the School District Training Teams in 1970 and sought in 1971 to provide alternative programs to upgrade the basic skills through the Borough-wide training of trainers through conferences, institutes, and workshops. The investigator attended AECU sessions for the trainers that were designed to provide training in basic skills in reading for paraprofessionals. The instructor had a great variety of material for trainers to peruse and a series of techniques. He demonstrated the use of various ways to motivate and develop skills on the part of adults to improve their reading skills. At one session, a trainer expressed the concern in this manner:

> "We agree that we need to know about these various materials and methods to work with Educational Assistants and Associates, but the time we have for training each two weeks is limited. There are other matters such as complex human relations problems that need to be resolved frequently that push these basic skills aside in the little time for training that we have. We need it, but other more important problems crowd these into the background."

The scope of the AECU training of trainers programs for 1970-71 may be depicted by listing the number of meetings and number in attendance for various types of training of trainers sessions. These consisted of conferences, institutes and workshops. Some were held at the district level, others at the Borough level and others were joint-borough meetings. (A listing of the range of topics, types of meetings, dates, and number of participants will be found in Appendix C.)

Objective "B" The basic purpose of this evaluation objective was to determine if there was an ongoing AECU training of trainers program for the paraprofessional trainers. A number of sources were used to check on this program. In the questionnaire, the paraprofessional trainers, called District Training Coordinators and Auxiliary Trainers, were asked to identify the three basic objectives of the training of trainers programs. Prior to the study, it was predicted that 60% would be able to identify the objectives and 60% would rate the training program as beneficial and useful. The basic training program took the form of a series of borough-wide training conferences, workshops and meetings on district levels.

Trainers Identify Objectives, But Not All Three

The findings indicated that while the Training Coordinators did identify the objectives for the training of trainers program -- 30% identified all three key objectives -- this was less than the 60% established as a criterion. From the Training Coordinators' responses, fifteen selected "coordination of college and school district" as a major program objective for the AECU training program. Fourteen selected both "the role of paraprofessional in school and community relations" and "clarifying agreements between Board of Education and Union." For details of Item 17, see below:

17. Which of the following would you select as three major objectives of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU) program for training trainers for 1970-71? Check three among the following:

10	Lesson planning and methods
14	Role of paraprofessional in school and community relations
6	Dealing with individualized instruction
15	Coordination of college and school district
14	Clarifying agreements between Board of Education and Union

The Training Coordinators were asked to rate the training of trainers programs in terms of whether the training of trainers programs were found to be beneficial and useful or not. The responses by twenty-five Training Coordinators indicated that 72%, or 18, reported that the training program was "useful and beneficial" to "some extent" or to "a great extent." Twenty percent, or five, Training Coordinators found the training of trainers programs to either be useful and beneficial to a slight extent or not useful

at all. The results for Item 18 may be shown as follows:

18. There has been a training program for the trainers; to what extent have you found the training of trainers beneficial and useful? Please check one:

9	a great extent
9	some extent
2	slight extent
3	not useful at all
2	undecided

Objective "C" The overall objective was to assess whether there has been an ongoing training program for the 750 Educational Assistants. At one point in the study, such a program was related to the direct responsibilities of AECU, but since the decentralization of New York City school districts, increasingly the content of the training program has been a school district level responsibility, and the community colleges have provided practicum and seminars for training assistants.

Educational Assistants Get Good Grades in College

The behavioral criterion established in the study was that 80% of the participants should receive a grade of "C" or better by the end of the program in June 1971. The records from the various community college coordinators were as follows:

TABLE III. Paraprofessional Performance in College Courses

COMMUNITY COLLEGE	NUMBER ENROLLED	RECEIVING GRADE "C" OR BETTER NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Bronx Community College	190	180	94
Borough of Manhattan Community College	357	309	86
Queensborough Community College	72	72	100
Kingsborough Community College (Brooklyn)	32	32	100
New York City Community College (Brooklyn)	268	258	94

Basic Objectives of Inservice Training Programs Are Known

The basic purposes of the ongoing training program for Assistants within each school district were stated in terms of three general objectives. These are shown below with the percentage of respondents who selected each item:

	Percent
. . . General background of theory in child development and learning, and principles of classroom management.	70
. . . Variety of teaching techniques, skill development, and dealing with problems arising from classroom situations.	84
. . . Range of human relations concerns that arise in the teaching situation	57

There are other objectives, but these key objectives seem to be the basic ones as set forth for the programs. The respondents were asked to identify the three basic goals of the training program within the school district. The purpose was to find out if the respondents would select the three stated goals as listed above. A criterion for performance was set that from a random sample of paraprofessionals, a given level would be able to identify the basic objectives of the inservice training program.

The overall response for Item 19 from 322 completed questionnaires showed 147 who identified the three basic objectives or forty-five percent. There were variations in percentages by Borough. One was sixty-eight percent (45 of 67), another was forty-two percent (36 of 86). A third was thirty-four percent (47 Of 139), whereas in the fourth Borough twenty-nine percent identified all three training objectives.

The three basic objectives were the most frequently selected alternatives in the forced choice question. More participants selected as a basic training program objective: "teaching techniques, skill development, and problems arising from classroom situations"; followed by "general background of theory child development, learning, and classroom management."

The total response to Item 19 is shown as follows:

19. Please check from the list below those items which were goals or aims of the inservice training program conducted within each school district:	QUEENS	MANHATTAN	BROOKLYN	BRONX
a) Interviewing skills and intake services	7	6	47	24
b) General background of theory, child development, learning, classroom management	61	72	34	23
c) Knowledge of testing children and interpretation of tests	4	14	23	5
d) Teaching techniques, skill development, and problems arising from classroom situations	68	68	106	31
e) Human relations concerns that arise in teaching situations	56	45	187	20
f) Skills as community worker and outreach functions	28	14	18	4

Inservice Network in New York City

The inservice training program for paraprofessionals is operating in school districts in New York City. The participants are involved in ongoing inservice training in their schools and with the training teams, and most are taking course work at one of the community colleges of the City University of New York. The mechanisms for inservice training are being used. In fact, the network and support structure for inservice training for paraprofessionals is admired as a model for teachers as well:

> "As a matter of actual operation, the [New York City] school system has designed and is implementing a more effective and appropriate inservice training program for its paraprofessionals than for its teachers. Many of these paraprofessional programs include on-site visits by the trainers, as well as release from school duties for the paraprofessional for training. In many districts, the training available for the paraprofessional far exceeds that available for the new teacher."[7]

Objective "D" This objective sought to determine the extent to which training guides have been prepared and disseminated to Educational Assistants. The AECU published a newsletter over the course of the year 1970-71. A contest was held to name the newsletter which at one point was called "Career Ladder" and then was renamed "Para-Phrase." During the year 1970-71, 5,000 copies of the one issue of the newsletter were printed and distributed. A major publication from 1970 was the Training Manual for Auxiliary Career which could serve as a resource training guide. The newsletter sought to bring together and exchange information about practices in various programs. Other materials were made available from the AECU to various district offices. The question asked in the evaluation was to what extent the paraprofessionals acknowledge that the newsletter and various training guides had been received and had been found to be useful. Item 20 in the questionnaire stated the matter as follows:

20. One of the functions of the AECU is to share information about the various career programs and training. Please check from the list below those items you have received and rate the materials for their usefulness in your work.

Received			Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Undecided	Limited Use	Useless
Yes ___	No ___	Career Ladder Newsletter	___	___	___	___	___
Yes ___	No ___	Training Manual Auxiliary Career	___	___	___	___	___
Yes ___	No ___	_____ list other materials	___	___	___	___	___
Yes ___	No ___	_____ district materials	___	___	___	___	___

[7]Maguire, Ellen S. "Proposal for Change: An Inservice Teacher-Training Program," New York Supervisor, Spring 1971, p. 8.

The response to Item 20 for each Borough is summarized in Table IV below:

TABLE IV. Dissemination of Training Guides by Borough

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Undecided	Limited Use	Useless
Career Ladder Newsletter "Para-Phrase"					
Queens	24	28	15	4	
Manhattan	18	6	2	3	1
Brooklyn	20	13	5	1	
Bronx	6	9	3		
Totals	68	56	25	8	1
Training Manual Auxiliary Career					
Queens	21	5			
Manhattan	10	5	2		
Brooklyn	7	1			
Bronx	9	3			
Totals	47	14	2	--	--
Other Materials					
Queens	3				
Manhattan	5				
Brooklyn	7	5			
Bronx	9				
Totals	24	5	--	--	--
District Materials					
Queens	6	1			
Manhattan	2				
Brooklyn	3				
Bronx	6				
Totals	17	1	--	--	--

Impact of AECU in Dissemination of Materials

Although there is clear evidence that the AECU did provide some training information and materials, it is apparent that such publications as the "Para-Phrase" or "Career Ladder" were not connected with AECU and respondents even claimed that they have not yet received the publication. One possible interpretation is that the publication becomes one additional piece of printed matter sent to participants through the mail. It should be noted that of those who say they received the publication, seventy-nine percent did rate it as useful.

The AECU "Training Manual for Auxiliary Career" was known to even fewer Educational Assistants than the newsletter. Only sixty-three of the over 300 respondents indicated that they had received copies of the manual. Ninety-eight percent of the response (61 of 63) rated the manual as useful. This manual was not designed for self instruction by paraprofessionals but was designed to serve as a resource guide for the trainers of paraprofessionals.

The responses on "other" materials and guides and "district materials" were twenty-four and eighteen respectively. These responses were so few as to cast doubt on the accuracy of the rating. Each district office has produced a considerable amount of training materials independently, as well as other materials supplied by AECU. It is not surprising that the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates do not know about the source for the curriculum guides and materials. The District Training Coordinators, Auxiliary Trainers, and School Supervisors know of these materials and guides and use them in their work.

Objective "E" The goal of this objective was to assess whether AECU provided a series of services of technical assistance and consultation functions.

First, the Project Director and Assistant Director were asked to describe the work of their office. A list of types of consultation and technical assistance functions was compiled. An effort was made to record the frequency of services in line with each type of service provided for a period of time. In addition, estimates of the utilization of AECU services by District Coordinators and by Educational Assistants was compiled. Interviews, analysis of documents, observations, and findings from questionnaires were used to provide the composite picture of the functions of AECU in providing technical assistance and consulation services

On the basis of data compiled in this study, the work of the AECU is not clearly perceived by the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates. The paraprofessional tends to view AECU as just another unit down at the central headquarters. Their contact has been in terms of having applications reviewed, stipends that are approved or disapproved. Even though though they are receiving copies of the newsletter, "Para-Phrase," the source may not be connected with AECU. The newsletter was delivered by the District Coordinator or the Auxiliary Trainer. Thus, "AECU" becomes an office only after a complaint has led an Educational Assistant to seek aid or has been referred to AECU to find out more information on a policy matter.

In the questionnaire, Item 21 was included to get examples from the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates as to when they have used

the services of AECU. The functions and services of AECU from Item 21 may be listed as follows:

1. Providing training services including training guides, training materials, training objectives and units.

Examples of the types of training services were: holding regular meetings or workshops to deal with training issues (instructional materials, classroom management, reading materials, math skills and materials); making available the Training Guide for Auxiliary Career; and aiding in curriculum scope and sequence.

2. Providing services that pertain to regulations or agreements with the Board of Education and the Union or colleges for the respective programs.

Examples of these services as listed by the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates were: giving welfare fund provisions; providing memos with advice on employment practices; providing information on release time; providing memos on guidelines; providing aid in securing clarification of UFT and Board of Education contract; and arranging individual conferences with appropriate parties to clarify issues and resolve disagreements.

3. Providing personnel services that include determining eligibility, clearing and certifying that persons are entitled to enter and remain in a program.

Examples of the personnel services were: answering questions concerning eligibility for college work-study program; clarifying personnel matters regarding the Board of Education and Union contract; adjusting pay scales; and providing referrals for information about the college program.

4. Coordinating groups and services that pertain to developing paraprofessional programs, training, and problems of practice that may involve policy.

Examples of the types of services noted in the questionnaire were: holding regular workshops; providing general liaison between colleges and district training teams; and holding regular meetings that provided a way for pertinent matters to be discussed.

The District Training Coordinators' estimates and examples of the AECU functions were specific and indicate that they were clearly aware of the services provided. The AECU functioned to serve the district training offices and these in turn served the school Educational Assistants and Associates.

District superintendents, school principals and supervisors contacted AECU for clarification of many matters regarding Board of Education policy concerning paraprofessionals. The AECU in turn has sent materials, training information, program information, newsletters and other information to the superintendents, principals and supervisors.

The AECU has therefore acted as a link between the city's Board of Education and the various district offices for general information about the paraprofessional programs. It has served as a resource for the Board of Education to aid in building new paraprofessional programs. It has provided consultation service and advice on paraprofessional programs for units within the educational system that are developing proposals.

The consultation and technical assistance functions of AECU include a range of interagency relationships. These include formal ties with unions, the City University of New York, State Department of Education, federal offices such as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Economic Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development (Model

Cities), Veterans Administration, and the Department of Labor. The staff has aided others within the Board of Education in preparation of proposals to develop paraprofessional programs in such areas as Social Maladjusted, Guidance, Mental Hygiene, and Attendance. Through the Urban-Rural program and the Career Opportunities program, AECU is working on paraprofessional programs with Model Cities groups in New York City. The Veterans Service program is one in which the AECU serves to secure field placement for veterans who are graduate students.

The Board of Education at times has designated AECU staff to interpret, intervene, explain, and clarify many matters relating to issues arising from contracts and agreements between the Board of Education and the various unions. AECU has served as liaison and messenger of existing policies and their clarification. It has brought together interested parties or groups around issues that need to be resolved.

The scale of the interagency relations involved is complex in the various programs, many with slightly different requirements, variations in rate of stipends, and degree of coverage for the participant.

The Board of Education has asked the AECU to review applications for various programs, certify eligibility in line with the various state and federal laws and regulations for programs. In a sense these are personnel functions in which the AECU monitors and certifies the eligibility of participants.

Objective "F" This objective sought to assess the operation of the comprehensive career program for the 750 Educational Assistants and Educational Associates in the program for strengthening early childhood (Grade K-2). The main idea was to find out the extent to which participants in the program had a clear idea about the three main aspects of the program: inservice training while on the job; opportunity to take college classes part time; and graduated scale with steps up in duties and pay. These major phases or parts of the program were combined with other reasonable items into Item 6 on the questionnaire. A stringent criterion established prior to the investigation was that eighty percent of the respondents should be able to identify the three aspects of the program.

There is a career ladder program and the participants are keenly aware of it. In fact, they are aware of the many subtle differences among the various paraprofessional programs within New York City. The findings from the responses to the questionnaire indicate that sixty percent of the respondents were able to identify all three key aspects of the career ladder program. This was below the criterion of eighty percent. There were variations in the responses by Borough:

TABLE V. Identification of Three Aspects of the Career Ladder Program

BOROUGH	NUMBER WHO PICKED ALL THREE ASPECTS	TOTAL RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Brooklyn (Kings)	71	103	69
Queens	51	78	65
Manhattan	36	77	47
Bronx	12	22	54
Totals	170	280	60%

These responses regarding knowledge of the parts of the career ladder program show that over half of the participants clearly understand the key parts of the program. Between eighty and one hundred percent of the participants from various Boroughs did identify "attending college courses part time" (269) and "training while on the job" (276) as key phases of the program. Sixty-one percent of the total responses identified "steps up in duties and pay" (173) as a key part of the program even though this part was a basic issue in a bitter struggle in recent years. The results of the responses to Item 6 below is shown in Table VI.

6. It has been stated that there are three parts to the career program in Early Childhood Education for Teaching Assistants and Teaching Associates in New York City. From the list below, please check the <u>three</u> main parts or phases of the career program.

TABLE VI. Career Ladder Program by Borough

	Learning to do community work	Attending college courses part time	Short-term temporary jobs in schools	Training while on the job	Steps up in duties & pay	One job, one salary step
Brooklyn (Kings)	33	103	1	84	69	8
Queens	18	69	8	78	52	2
Manhattan	43	75	2	92	38	10
Bronx	2	22	--	22	14	2
TOTALS	96	269	11	276	173	22

A call for clear support of the concept of career ladder was recommended in the 1969-70 evaluation by New York University. At that time funds were available from a number of sources only for specific categories, i.e., kindergarten teachers. At that time the elements of career ladder included:

1. a long term commitment to the program so that paraprofessionals may complete the career ladder and college degree program;
2. a more flexible utilization of teaching assistants at all primary grade levels, rather than just at the kindergarten level (Some effort along this line has been made by broadening the interpretation of Early Childhood to mean K-2 grades rather than limited to kindergarten.); and
3. a role differentiation between Educational Assistant and Associate is made, with differences in salary and in responsibilities.

These three elements constitute the basic parts of Item 6 in the questionnaire regarding the career ladder program.

The concept of career ladder is of crucial importance in 1971, since it pertains to a number of evaluation objectives. It is the central thrust of the program at this stage. One recommendation by the New York University team in 1969-70 seems especially to portend the situation in 1971 as follows:

> "It is necessary that AECU and the City University work cooperatively to review Career Ladder curriculum. Consideration should be given to the development of some standard curriculum components or at least guidelines for equivalence and transfer of credit among units of the City University. Special attention must be paid to the development of equitable policies for transfer of credits from community colleges to senior colleges. Serious consideration should be given to standardizing policies regarding the granting of intermediate degrees at the end of two years of college work. Provisions should be made for establishing minimal criteria for automatic matriculation at four-year colleges. AECU might also be useful in work with local college coordinators and their respective faculties, offering staff orientation and consultation in an effort to maximize the relevance of the career ladder program for the people it aims to serve."[8]

A further tangible indication of commitment to the career ladder was announced by the New York City Board of Education and the Union. Commitment was made for $450,000 for the support of paraprofessionals (Grades K-2) for attendance in college courses toward degrees and eventual teaching certificates. Again some confusion followed since news coverage did not make clear which paraprofessional programs were covered and AECU received numerous phone calls

---

[8] "An Evaluation of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit Program," New York City, Title I, Project Center for Field Research and School Services, New York University, August 1970.

and inquiries from participants as to their status.[9]

Objective "G" There is a range of issues involved in the work-study elements of the career ladder program that go beyond the scope of this evaluation. This particular evaluation objective is concerned with pinpointing key issues in the work-study program from the viewpoint of recipients, the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates. There are many programs for paraprofessionals in New York City, however, the data for this report is limited to the paraprofessionals involved in the Strengthening of Early Childhood programs.

A series of Educational Assistants, Educational Associates, and District Coordinators were interviewed. Then personnel responsible for various aspects of the college programs for paraprofessionals were interviewed, including some college coordinators for paraprofessional training. From these interviews and others, a series of tentative issues regarding the work-study program were formulated.

The issues took the form of matriculation issues, articulation issues, and attitudinal issues. Matriculation issues included such matters as eligibility, stipends, summer sessions, release time, etc. Questionnaire Items 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30 dealt with these issues. Articulation issues included concern over getting full credit when transferring from junior to senior colleges, and getting into required courses at times available. Items 24, 25, 26, and others in the questionnaire produced information pertinent to articulation. The attitudinal issues involved in the program cut across other areas. Items 27, 28, and other items brought some light on these issues.

How Far Along in the Program are the Participants?

One question asked the participants how many units of college credit would they have completed by July 1971. The results are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII. College Credits Completed by July 1971

TOTAL COMPLETED CREDITS BY JULY 1971	BROOKLYN	BRONX	QUEENS	MANHATTAN	TOTALS
1-9	21	2	11	13	47
10-20	1	6	2	5	14
21-30	9	6	7	7	29
31-40	8	2	0	3	13
41-50	16	5	2	5	28
51-60	11	0	2	6	19
61-70	7	8	1	3	19
71-80	3	0	2	1	6
81-90	0	0	2	3	5
91 or more	1	2	0	2	5

[9] New York Times, February 7, 1971.

A number of the participants are clear about which senior college they plan to attend, and when they expect to attend. Participants generally plan to attend a senior college nearest their home and place of work. Answers to the question: "When do you expect to complete the community college?" are shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII. Year Expected to Start Senior College

YEAR TO COMPLETE	BROOKLYN	BRONX	QUEENS	MANHATTAN	TOTALS
1971	9	0	4	9	22
1972	32	8	4	9	53
1973	9	8	4	6	27
1974	0	0	1	3	4
1975	10	1	1	1	13

Assisting the Teacher, Raising the Family, and Attending College Part Time

As the findings to be reported below indicate, the role of the paraprofessional -- working in school during the day, caring for a family, and attending college courses in the late afternoon and evening, makes for a crowded schedule. The findings seem to suggest, in many instances that the family is required to "suffer" or "change" in order for the paraprofessional to get the college degree. In the past, many have worked full time on jobs and attended college part time. In the case of the paraprofessional programs, there are additional incentives, i.e.,release time from the job in order to attend college courses. There are also stipends paid while attending courses. These matters were part of the union contract. Different programs allow slight variations in the amount of release time and in what expenses are covered by the stipend.

The findings from the questionnaires give some sample of how many of the respondents are attending college courses, where they are attending, how many units they have completed by July 1971, which senior college they expect to attend, release time issues, how attending college while working is working out, which units have been helpful, and what the paraprofessional looks forward to in the future. Since the sample includes only those who replied to these questions, these responses cannot be said to represent the opinions or experiences of all in this program or other paraprofessional programs.

Where are the Paraprofessionals Attending College?

The findings show that for the most part paraprofessionals attend the nearest community college. Results show:

Brooklyn (Kings County): forty attending Kingsborough Community College and New York City Community College (in Brooklyn); three at Brooklyn College;

four at University of Massachusetts (Extension); one at Richmond College; and one at Long Island University.

Bronx: Twenty-eight attending Bronx Community College; and two at Fordham.

Queens: Fifty-five at Queensborough Community College; one at New York City Community College; three at Borough of Manhattan Community College; and thirteen at LaGuardia Community College.

Manhattan: Twenty-seven attending Borough of Manhattan Community College; three at Bronx Community College; two at Lehman College; two at Mary Mount College; one at Brooklyn College; and one at Richmond College.

From Matriculation to Articulation -- On to the Senior Colleges

There are a number of paraprofessionals completing course work at the junior college level who are about to go on to senior colleges. The issues surrounding the transfer of credit from community colleges are of paramount concern to the paraprofessionals. Each senior college makes its own decisions as to curricula, although it is the policy of the City University of New York that completion of work from junior colleges in good standing is acceptable for registration in senior colleges. The dominant issues relate to becoming accepted by the "mainstream." Paraprofessionals have been involved in "special" courses and have resented being treated as less than "regular." For example, the special courses start after the regular semester and before the regular summer session begins. Participants were frustrated by lack of clear information about registration, eligibility, and benefits under respective stipend plans. These issues are as relevant in August 1971 as they were in August 1970 when the recommendations of the New York University evaluation team suggested "AECU might...coordinate work with local college coordinators and offer consultation in an effort to maximize the relevance of the career ladder program...." What was stated then in terms of content and methods applies equally well now. There is lacking a clear commitment and a pinpointing of responsibilities for coordination of support structures to ensure articulation and continuity from community college to senior college through matriculation of the paraprofessionals in the senior college degree program. Paraprofessionals should then receive equivalent credit for previous work.

The City University representatives have pointed to the many other programs in 1970-71, such as "Open Admissions," that brought many more students to CUNY than ever before. CUNY has organized a committee on articulation consisting of all community college coordinators to examine the issues and perhaps it may resolve many of them in the future.

The various paraprofessional programs represent to the City University an array of offerings that are moving toward standardization of policies. There are many programs, each with some slight variation from another. The New York University evaluation in 1969-70 recommended that there be some standardized policies toward granting intermediate degrees at the end of two years of college work, i.e., that there be "provisions...made for establishing minimal criteria for automatic matriculation at four year colleges."

Concern was openly expressed by staff and personnel that the paraprofessionals may be excluded, or that classes in both community colleges and senior colleges will be filled. If so, then their continuity in the program will be lost. Would this be due to lack of sufficient planning for space for transfers from the two-year college program into the senior colleges of City University?

During the spring semester registration is a case in point. The issues for paraprofessionals are not only pre-registration or space, but degree of fiscal support and release time for students from the HRA paraprofessional programs to attend college.

It should be recorded that the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit personnel have attempted to get some clarification on a number of these matters on the degree of commitment and support for the paraprofessionals from a number of sources and personnel, including the Board of Education, the Union representatives, community colleges, and the City University.

The committee on articulation of CUNY may be able to deal with some of the issues and resolve difficulties of continuity and equity of transfer. The decision making takes place on many levels: the Board of Higher Education, within each of the community colleges, and within the senior colleges of CUNY faculty council.

Which Senior Colleges Do the Participants Expect to Attend?

Responses show that the participants expect to attend the senior colleges generally nearest to them. There are some exceptions at the senior college level. The results for Item 26 are depicted in Table IX.

TABLE IX. Senior Colleges Participants Expect to Attend

SENIOR COLLEGE	BROOKLYN	BRONX	QUEENS	MANHATTAN	TOTALS
City College CUNY	1	2	2	12	17
Hunter College CUNY	2	2	2	6	12
Brooklyn College CUNY	31	-	-	-	31
Queens College CUNY	2	-	6	-	8
York College	-	-	5	-	5
Baruch College CUNY	2	-	-	3	5
Lehman College	-	15	-	-	15
Boston University	-	-	2	-	2
Fordham University	-	2	-	1	3

How Has Release Time Worked Out?

The provision of release time clause in a contract has enabled many persons to attend college and take advanced work in numerous fields. Given the rapid expansion of knowledge and need for new methods and techniques, this provision is likely to be found in more agreements as an important benefit for all concerned. Not all aspects of the release time provision work without some difficulties. From the point of view of the school, the paraprofessional leaves school early in order to get to college classes. This means that special provisions must be made in her absence from school. Some teachers may resent the paraprofessionals' leaving. From the colleges' point of view, they cannot schedule classes for students without knowing when both instructors and students will be available. From the point of view of the paraprofessionals, they may have the release time, but sometimes the classes they need are not scheduled at that time. Release time does allow some time for study and for travel to the college. A sample of comments from paraprofessionals to Item 29 were as follows:

"Release time enables me to get to take the early classes, but the courses I need are not offered at that time...."
"Night courses are inconvenient...."
"Hours for courses are not convenient...."
"Too much rush from school to home to college to home... family sacrifice is great...."
"When course not offered in the day, I must pay for additional baby sitters to take the evening classes...."

Most of the comments were in support of the release time as a good idea and very appreciative of the opportunity to attend college.

Reactions to the College Experience and Teaching Opportunities

The reactions of the Training Assistants and Training Associates to their college experiences and the opportunity to become a teacher are poignant. The information was gathered from Items 27 and 28 asking for examples of pleasant and unpleasant experiences that have occurred.

The number of examples of pleasant experiences outnumbered those that were listed as unpleasant. Many stated that there were no important experiences that were unpleasant. The pleasant experiences cited for Item 27 included comments such as the following:

The program has interested me in: poetry; music; science; art work; becoming a better teacher; children's reactions to puppets; psychology; children's reactions to books; field trips; professional meetings on some phase of my work.

College courses are:
"an aid to becoming a professional...."
"a dream come true...."
"geared to our interests...."
"useful when related to classroom experiences and we can share experiences of others coping with similar problems...."
"exciting if the instructor is exciting...."

Other pleasant experiences were:

"getting accepted at York College...."

"meeting childhood friends years later in college courses...."

"taking over teaching and being observed...."

These experiences are summed up in the comment: "I am very pleased and proud and hope I live up to expectations."

There were a series of comments relating to the unpleasant experiences that Educational Assistants and Educational Associates have had in connection with the program. These comments were much less frequent than the pleasant ones cited above. The examples below are taken from responses to Item 28.

The most frequently mentioned problem was "I cannot register for a required course at the time it is available...." "The course I want to take is not offered this semester...." Economic factors also enter into the comments: "No money to buy all the books required...." "Need books, but no money...."

Another group of comments related to the college course work methods and relevance of the course work: "The college personnel did not know about the career ladder program...." "The study of methods used raise some questions about those being used in schools...." "An instructor was to observe me, but did not come to see the demonstration lesson...."

Some examples of unpleasant experiences related more to the actual difficulties encountered in the course work: "There is too much homework in some courses...." "There is not enough release time...." "Too much required reading...." "The exams produce undue tension...." "When we need tutors, we need them now!"

What Do the Teaching Assistants and Teaching Associates Look Forward to in the Remaining College Work?

Although this open-ended question focused upon the future college work, the responses extended the scope of the question to comment on the years ahead in ways that reveal some of their hopes, expectations and tensions:

"More time for study and research...."

"The elimination of group games...."

"A more compact and meaningful program that really applies to what we are doing and will be doing in the classroom...."

"Credit for classroom and life experience...."

"A combined college and student teaching credit program...."

"Getting my degree and becoming a teacher as soon as possible...."

"More psychology and more hard work, I enjoy it!..."

"Graduating with a B.A. degree...."

"Getting the best marks to complete my education so that I may be a better teacher, good to the children, and good for the school and the community...."

"Serving children better with more training and understanding...."

"Enough funds to be able to continue and get the degree...."

"More education and help toward my goals...."

"Educating myself so that I am able to assist the teacher and the children...."

"Completing with acceptable grades and learning all there is to know about teaching children and making myself a better individual...."

"Graduation...."
"Finishing the next sixty credits...."
"Getting the degree, doing research, traveling and teaching...."
"Keeping abreast of what happens...."
"A little more release time...."
"Completing the college work and becoming a good teacher who will help our children learn...."

These comments reflect not only expectations of the college years but also the values of the participants as a group of prospective teachers.

Objective "H" The evaluation objective was to assess whether classroom performance of the paraprofessionals has improved since last year. One behavioral indicator established was that seventy percent of a sample of field supervisors would state that there has been an increase in the quality and quantity of responsibilities carried out by the paraprofessionals. This evaluation was not central to the current study. The sources for data used in this objective were both the questionnaire to paraprofessionals for self-rating and the questionnaire to supervisors or training coordinators. An extensive investigation of this question would constitute a separate evaluation study in itself. Data from the questionnaires has been supplemented by additional material from a recently completed and extensive study of the classroom performance of paraprofessionals.[10]

New Duties and Tasks of Paraprofessionals

Did paraprofessionals take on new tasks and duties during 1970-71 and, if so, how well were they being carried out? An open-ended question on the questionnaires to paraprofessionals and their supervisors asked for examples of "new duties and tasks being carried out this year by paraprofessionals." Respondents were asked to evaluate the performance of these new tasks and duties as "improved," "about the same," or "worse than before."

The recent "In-Depth Study of Paraprofessionals," including 352 paraprofessionals from fifty representative schools, fifty school principals, 307 teachers, and 194 small groups of three or four pupils each, indicated a growing responsibility and an increase of significant duties to paraprofessionals, and showed that they have grown on the job.

The overwhelming judgment of those teachers and principals interviewed was that as they gain experience, paraprofessionals are being given more significant work. Only three percent reported any reduction in responsibility. Eighty-five percent of the principals and fifty percent of the teachers reported that the paraprofessionals are getting more challenging work, or about sixty-five percent of all those interviewed. Over fifty percent of the principals thought that the paraprofessionals could be given additional duties

---

[10] Brickell, Henry M. "An In-Depth Study of Paraprofessionals in District Decentralized ESEA Title I and New York State Urban Education Projects in New York City Schools," Institute for Educational Development, December, 1970.

and tasks that required more from them. It was concluded in the study that in more than fifty percent of the schools, the growing degree of responsibility and the gaining of job skills while on the job are the chief effects of the program on para-professionals.[11]

TABLE X. Increase in Para-professionals' Responsibilities

The actual question and data were as follows:
"Do you feel that the paraprofessional's job has changed in any way since they began working here?"

	More Responsibility	Less Responsibility	No Comment	No Response	Total
Teachers:					
Number	103	3	22	60	188
Percent	55	2	11	32	100%
Principals:					
Number	32	1	4	1	38
Percent	84	3	11	3	100%

The findings from responses to the question concerning new duties and tasks are reported below for Brooklyn, Manhattan and Queens school districts. The responses focused upon new classroom duties and tasks and therefore are not meant to be interpreted as a comprehensive listing of tasks and duties.

TABLE XI. New Classroom Duties in Brooklyn, Manhattan and Queens

CLASSIFICATION	MANHATTAN		QUEENS		BROOKLYN		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Presenting information and conducting recitation								
a. class as a whole	8	9.6	16	8.9	8	7.0	22	8.3
b. small group	43	52.0	23	34.0	48	42.0	114	43.0
c. tutorial	13	16.0	7	10.3	10	9.0	30	11.2
Subtotals	(64	77.0)	(46	59.0)	(66	58.0)	(166	62.5)
2. Preparing and planning lessons and units and concluding lessons	4	4.8	16	23.5	11	9.6	31	12.8
3. Keeping records	6	7.2	1	1.5	1	.87	8	3.0
4. Collecting information	3	3.6	1	1.5	-	-	4	1.5
5. Supervision								
a. class or large group	6	7.2	5	7.3	16	14.0	27	10.0
b. small group	-	-	-	-	3	2.5	3	1.0
6. Comforting children	-	-	1	1.5	1	.87	2	.75
7. Disciplining children	-	-	1	1.5	1	.87	2	.75
8. Testing/evaluating	-	-	3	4.45	1	.87	4	1.5
9. Field trips	-	-	4	5.9	1	.87	5	1.8
10. Parent conference and home-school liaison	-	-	-	-	4	3.5	4	1.5
TOTALS	83		78		105		266	

[11] Ibid., pp. 77-78 and question 21 (teachers) and 16 (principals) A-99 and A-107.

The responses show that Educational Assistants and Associates have estimated that they are increasingly carrying out a series of duties and tasks this year related to the general teaching functions of helping the regular classroom teacher. Nearly sixty-three percent of the responses listed "presenting information and conducting recitation" (Manhattan 77%; Queens 59%; and Brooklyn 58%). An analysis of the types of activities in presenting information and conducting recitation indicates that more than two-thirds of the presentations and recitations are conducted with small groups (43 of 64, or 66% for Manhattan; 23 Of 36, or 64% for Queens; and 48 of 66, or 72% for Brooklyn). In other words, for nearly two-thirds of the time that the paraprofessionals listed new activities this year, they listed working with small groups.

The second most frequently listed new tasks and duties were planning and preparing units for conducting and presentation. Thirteen percent of the overall responses were for some type of planning and preparation activity. These activities frequently were joint planning with the teacher.

The third ranked new task and duty was that of supervision. Eleven percent of all responses were for some type of supervisory activity. Nearly all (ninety percent) of the supervision was either in large groups or for the class as a whole. These included bus duty, hall duty, lunch duty, and other monitoring, safety, or social control type of functions.

The findings of this study are in contrast to those reported in other research on paraprofessionals in New York City. Only two respondents cited as new tasks and duties "comforting" and "disciplining," while these activities were cited seventy-one percent of the time and sixty-seven percent of the time, respectively, in other research.[12]

The studies are in agreement in over sixty percent of the responses cited concerning presenting information, and over fifty percent concerning presenting information. One interpretation of the differences in studies may be that the respondents were asked to identify new tasks and duties, and they regarded "comforting" and "disciplining" as ongoing tasks and not new duties.

In terms of the criterion for the objective for the performance of paraprofessionals as rated by supervisors, the evidence cited above indicates that an average of sixty-five percent rated the paraprofessionals as "improving." Although this is below the seventy percent standard, it is strong support for the increase in tasks, duties, and responsibilities of the paraprofessionals.

The data gathered in this study about new tasks and duties were mainly self-ratings by the Educational Assistants and Educational Associates and therefore cannot be the sole source to evaluate the quality of performance. However, the negative self-ratings may be used. In this connection, it may be noted that there were few negative ratings as to performance either remaining the same or becoming worse during this last year by the field supervisors. The negative self-ratings by the paraprofessionals can be viewed as complaints. For example: "being transferred from class to class is worse this year"; "dealing with a disruptive child -- worse this year"; "bulletin board duty is worse this year"; or "various types of supervision duties seem worse this year."

In many instances the supervisors stated that the performance in general of the paraprofessionals had improved, but the details were left unspecified. They listed that paraprofessionals tried new methods and augmented the teachers'

---

[12] Ibid. p. 70.

roles in innumerable ways.

The Educational Assistants and Associates seem to be carrying out more functions along with the teachers, especially in small-group work, and look forward to the status of becoming a teacher, yet reflect the same disapproval that teachers have expressed for monitoring work, supervision, and "extra" duties.

Objective "I" Item 16 dealt with the degree of satisfaction in the job as related to the training program. The question dealt with one of the central objectives. Respondents indicated that sixty-seven percent definitely believed that the training programs helped to make the job more personally satisfying, and another twenty-four percent felt that the training helped to some extent. Together, ninety-one percent of the respondents found that the training was either definitely helpful or helpful to some extent, while some six percent found that the training was either uneven or did not make any difference. Less than three percent reported that the training at times seemed to interfere with job satisfaction. These results are shown below:

TABLE XII. Job Satisfaction and Training

16. In the carrying out of your job, as a result of the training program, would you say that you have found yourself and others believe that the training program:

	QUEENS	MANHATTAN	BROOKLYN	BRONX	TOTALS N	TOTALS %
a) definitely helped to make the job more satisfying personally	57	41	71	15	184	67
b) helped to some extent to make the job more satisfying personally	23	21	16	7	67	24
c) at times the training program helped but results were uneven	2	6	4	2	14	4
d) the training program did not make any difference in making the job more personally satisfying	1	2	2	1	6	2
e) at times it seemed to interfere with me getting satisfaction from the job	5	1	1	1	8	3

Objective "J" The degree of increase in utilization of Auxiliary Educational Career Unit by the School Districts.

The findings regarding the utilization of the AECU by the training programs of the various school districts is mixed. On the one hand there are increasing number of school districts utilizing the training of trainers services provided by the AECU this year compared to past years. On the other hand, there are more actual program services being carried out directly by the school districts themselves without the direct use of the AECU.

The increase in number of school districts being served by AECU for training of trainers programs and other services, has been ten more school districts this year as compared to last year. In 1970-1971 there were thirty of the thirty-one school districts being served by the AECU, whereas last year twenty of the school districts were being served. The pattern of growth of services from the centralized New York City services in 1967 through the period of decentralized and changing school district for 1968 and 1969 may be depicted in the chart below:

Year	Number of School Districts Serviced by AECU
1967	Centralized NYC Board of Education
1968	Centralization and Decentralization beginning
1969	Decentralization Law
1969-70	20 School Districts
1970-71	30 School Districts

Twenty-six of the thirty-one school districts participated participated in 1970-71 in the regularly scheduled training of trainers programs and more participated in occasional meetings and utilized services from AECU.

A criterion of 30% percent increase in services to number of school districts was established for this objective, the number of school districts added for services was ten or 50 percent for 1970-71 or beyond the criterion of 30% percent.

In 1969-70 twenty-four of the 30 school districts qualified for ESEA grants. Eighteen of the 24 conducted District Training Teams with the aid of AECU. Six of the school districts operated independently of grants and AECU in 1969-70, the school districts while remaining autonomous under the school decentralization law have used some of the services of the AECU.

An overview of the number and types of training programs held by AECU during 1970-71 for each Borough may be depicted as follows:

TABLE XIII. Number and Type of Training

Type of Training	Borough School Districts	Number During 1970-71	Average Attendance	Total	Comments
Borough Conferences	Bronx 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	7	17	119	All Districts
	Brooklyn 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23	7	19	126	All Districts 21 has one school; 22 has no school
	Manhattan 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	7	21	147	All Districts
	Queens 24, 27, 28, 29, 30	7	13	91	All Districts 25 & 26 have no paraprofessionals
Joint Borough Institutes	Bronx and Manhattan 1 thru 12	4	25	101	All Districts
	Brooklyn and Queens 13 thru 30	4	13	91	All Districts

Functions of AECU. One purpose of this evaluation objective is to pinpoint the evidence as to which functions AECU has carried out.

In the transition from centralization to decentralization, a number of shifts have been made from central offices to school districts. There are still a number of points of contact that are centralized both from within the system and external to it. AECU has developed as a unit specializing in the training of paraprofessionals.

The AECU has been regarded as a specialized unit in a number of matters that relate to paraprofessional programs, paraprofessional training, and overall policies governing these programs. As the number of programs utilizing paraprofessionals have increased, the services of AECU have been called upon in devising new programs, clarifying policy and contracts regarding such programs. The Board of Education has asked that staff energies at the central AECU office be devoted to carrying out these services and functions in connection with a series of paraprofessional training programs.

This was a new idea and a new program. It has grown, changed, and spread. The functions of the unit have shifted from providing direct services and a centralized staff to a central unit serving decentralized districts in a voulntary way by providing institutes, conferences and programs for training District Trainers. There still remain, however, a series of fiscal, contractual, certifying functions that are centralized! The AECU provides a combination of two major functions: (1) decentralized services, i.e., providing liaison, coordination and consultation services to decentralized school districts; and (2) centralized services in providing fiscal check-points for certifying eligibility, interpreting contracts, building programs, and dealing with funding sources of the city, state and federal governments. AECU is a source for information about paraprofessional programs operated by the Board. This unit is a resource of information and does not simply refer from unit to unit with each unit abdicating responsibility.

As to the work of AECU as a unit of the Board of Education, it cannot speak with an independent voice. It has carried out the functions described in this report and in line with program objectives. Its program was to coordinate and to administer personnel. The training of trainers program utilized consultants on topics selected by AECU in consultation with the districts. AECU has increased the number of districts served this year by fifty percent.

It does not follow that only the AECU could carry out these functions. A number of other units within the Board of Education carry out similar functions relating to curriculum, training, personnel, and staff relations in clarifying Union-Board contract matters.

The AECU presently still lacks both the prestige and power to implement many of the needed additions. The New York University evaluation team recommended last year that this lack of clarity of Board policy still remains. The New York University 1969-70 evaluation did compare programs for AECU and non-AECU districts for kindergarten teachers with paraprofessionals. The findings showed few differences among various State Urban Education and Title 1 programs. In non-AECU districts, there was no staff for district training and therefore responsibility for inservice training was less. This year, the need for added dimensions go beyond that of AECU.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The central purposes of the evaluation of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit of the Personnel Office of the Board of Education of the City of New York, were to assess the effectiveness and the extent of the programs and services provided. This study sought to evaluate the functions of AECU by means of a model that combined four evaluation objectives that concentrated on products, and six objectives that involved processes. A series of conclusions and recommendations emerge from the data already reported, but these conclusions and recommendations result from an analysis of broader issues of the subject while conducting the evaluation. This section will review the principal findings, formulate the conclusions around basic issues in the context of 1970-71 findings, and then indicate the recommendations.

Review of Findings

Objective A - A number of basic skills programs were instituted; some were for the training of trainers through institutes and workshops. These indicate both progress and resistance. Results of a pilot study of one basic skills program showed approval by 92 percent of Educational Assistants as participants. Standardized achievement test scores showed high gains in vocabulary and spelling.

Objective B - The AECU program for training District Trainers was rated by the participants as "helpful" by 70 percent of the respondents. This was above the criterion of 60 percent. Only 30 percent could identify all three major training objectives.

Objective C - Data from the community colleges showed that over 80 percent of the paraprofessionals who took Parcticums and Seminars had grades of "C" or better. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were able to identify all three key objectives of the inservice training, but this was below the criterion of 80 percent.

Objective D - The dissemination and use of curriculum by AECU was reported to be "useful" by 98 percent of the respondents. Few among the one-fifth of the Educational Assistants who replied gave AECU credit for the publications.

Objective E - Information gathered demonstrated that AECU was carrying out a series of technical assistance and consultation functions. The personnel and administrative tasks to facilitate the programs, and the substantive clearinghouse functions of paraprofessional training were time consuming.

Objective G - Major issues of work-study elements of the career ladder were matriculation, registration, release time, articulation, and attitudes. Release time to attend community colleges was working well. Participants attended, and still expect to continue, in colleges near where they work. Frustration occurs when registration for required courses is closed. In the time squeeze of the career ladder work-study schedule among elements working in schools and attending college part time, it is the family that is "neglected" (or must change). Motivation and commitment is high among participants, yet fear that long-term commitment by the Board, and feelings of lack of power, persist.

Objective H - Changes in the performance of Educational Assistants and Educational Associates show that the major effect of the program is a continual growth toward the central functions of teaching this year. Sixty-two percent of responses listed under new duties and tasks: presenting information; and conducting recitation in small groups (43%), through tutorial (11%), and to classes as-a-whole (8%). Other data cited 85% of the Principals and 50% of teachers or an average of 65%, stating that paraprofessionals are doing more significant and challenging work this year than in the past

Objective I - Results showed that 90 percent of the respondents found personal satisfaction on the job due to the training that was either "definitely helpful" (66%) or "helpful to some extent"(24%).

Objective J - Voluntary utilization of the services on a regular basis of AECU by the community school district training teams was up from 20 to 30, as compared to last year. This was a 50% increase in number of school districts served.

Seven of the ten behavior criteria for performance established prior to the investigation were met or surpassed.

Investigator's note: Having entered into this Evaluation Project after it was formulated, the investigator adds the following note. Common sense dictates that each metaphor: career ladder, basic skills, inservice training, training trainers, work-study, dissemination of information; all refer to multidimensional experiences and events. The few indicators used in this study and the small randomly drawn respondents to the questionnaire do not tell the whole story. There are many dimensions to each of these events that are not measured here by the questionnaire; but hopefully the other methods - observations, interviews, and analysis -may have broadened the quality of data. In recent years, the stipulation for behavioral criteria has approached a research fad with a near - legislative mandate which becomes mechanically translated into what is frequently a trival measure of one indicator of some activity. In this investigation, logical analysis and observation used beyond the level of behavioral criteria required for some indication. Clearly there is a logical difference between two Educational Assistants, one of whom can name all three objectives of the career ladder program, and one who cannot. But what does this knowledge predict about classroom behavior as a teacher other than reading comprehension?

Issues Behind the Issues

There are a number of unstated issues that determine many of the controversies surrounding the career ladder program. These issues behind the issues may be listed briefly and related to the particular conclusions of this study and to the recommendations.

The ecological, demographic, and political context of the career ladder program in New York City is one of crisis-to-crisis operation. This pattern is pervasive whether it be within a district, the Unions, or the Board of Education of the City of New York. Delays, buck passing, and lack of long-term sense of responsibility for planning and evaluation are evident. Perhaps this is because New York City is larger and more complex, and has great range

of diversity of ethnic and interest groups, than other places that have career ladder programs.

The crisis-to-crisis pattern operates in budget negotiations, agreements and contract talks, and interpretation of the implementation of contracts in New York City. The budget matters with various city agencies have implication for short-range and long-range planning for staff allocation, and scheduling.

Some might claim that the scale and complexity of New York City requires many sources for checking and working out various group interests. This type of "disjointed incrementalism" or the "Science of Muddling Through" is the name of the game with the array of political interests and given the size of the problems that need to be confronted.[13] The city-state-federal relationships in the public sector constitute a major source of confusion in defining clearly the parameters of planning possibilities and resources for implementation.

A second unstated issue is that of the present fiscal crisis. The new era ahead is one of belt tightening, since money is going to continue to be tight. It is not just the Board of Education of New York City annual budget which is involved. The dynamics of the larger economy and policy enters into the cycle of college semester, school staffing, contract negotiation agreements, and budget cuts. Regardless of the fine rhetoric about the merits of the career ladder program, it takes money to pay for the program. The national wage and price freeze symbolizes the situation. In 1971-72 even more than in 1970-71, money is going to be tight. The lack of clear commitment by the Board of Education to long-range or permanent support of the career ladder program as called for by the 1969-70 New York University evaluation, may not be due to lack of commitment on the part of Board members to the idea, but rather to the basic economics of the current scene. A number of steps were taken in 1970-71. It should be noted that the Board has had little problem in the past in passing resolutions on measures, although it has not implemented these positions with deeds. New York City has a fiscal dependent budget and tax framework which does not allow for visible public outcries against such action through voting on such measures. The recession and unemployment have cut tax revenues to the city. There are fiscal sources beyond the city, namely the state and federal resources, but these, too, have revenue cuts. Since there are mixed sources for funds for programs, and many groups need to form agreement, and since funding requirements vary, many questions remain about securing funds for programs in a time when public fiscal and budgetary problems are at a crisis point.

A third issues behind the issues is the context of this evaluation is the partial decentralization law that gives a semblance of responsibilities to District School Boards, although many matters remain centralized. Fiscal matters remain central for many programs. Teacher and auxiliary personnel contracts are citywide. Contracts and programs affecting the paraprofessional and implied therein are coordinated, and personnel matters are cleared and administered by

---

[13] Charles Lindblom Policy Making Process (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey) Prentice Hall, 1970.

the central New York City Board of Education (viz, AECU). AECU has vacillated between the decentralized advisory role in program, consultation and voluntary training role, and that of the centralized coordination of program, personnel, eligibility and certification. Centralized codes of operation continue within the central administrative structure with little input or diversity from the field of 30 districts. The Board of Education is linked through regulations with the Board of Estimates, City University of New York, State Urban Education, and federal offices such as OE , Title I, II, and III of ESEA in figuring out the interpretation of programs.

It should be noted that many of the 31 decentralized school districts in New York City are larger than most local educational agencies (LEA). These LEA's are eligible for independent funding under many state and federal programs. Free open access to information regarding federal and state guidelines for various programs ought to be made available to each community district. A number of the federal programs such as ESEA Title 1 require training programs built in to the paraprofessional program.

It is beyond the scope of this study to specify the advantages and disadvantages of decentralization versus centralization, that has been documented elsewhere. The purpose here is to set forth major issues that impinge upon the operation of a centralized unit of the Board of Education with the decentralized paraprofessional program operation.

A fourth issue behind the issues is the crisis of leadership. The complexity and interdependence of New York City also invites helplessness Inevitably in discussions of problems of programs in New York City with staff as the conversation moves along, soon an opening is found to move the subject into the bureaucratic divisions of how problems are handled here, in line with codes and operations. Soon there is an abdication of responsibility for a larger part of the problem. All too frequently being part of the system one becomes part of the problems rather than contributing to their solutions.

In a time when innovative programs have expanded, where is the micro teaching in paraprofessional programs? When is programmed instruction used? Where is the program with systematic individualized training? Where are the evaluation of pupil gains for those who have had teachers with auxiliary aides, and pupils with only teachers for K-2?

Where are the sources for leadership of the paraprofessional career ladder programs and beyond to better learning on the part of children in school? Are the specialists on national New Careers programs within the colleges and universities sources for leadership?

Are the unions as bargaining agent the source for educational leadership? Is AECU too closely tied to the Board of Education policies to initiate or even to convene? Do funding sources for City, State and Federal prefer dealing with one source rather than 30 school districts? Do paraprofessionals represent an interest group broad enough to form some independent organization or coalition? Are the community boards of education principals, and teachers sources of program leadership? Are the paraprofessionals proposing changes? What educational program variations are Principals and Superintendents and Community Boards

proposing?

Is Albert Shanker, the head of the New York City UFT, right when he contends that the Community Boards are so pre-occupied with political, administrative and fiscal matters that they are not accomplishing or encouraging educational innovations? He raised the question of whether dividing the city into 30 districts would help Johnny read any better.[14]

One basic emphasis of the programs evaluated in this study has been a concentration of changes of input without a systematic focus upon outcomes expected! The lack of a systematic instructional concern over outcomes does not only exist in these programs, it is widespread. Such an instructional strategy is important so that issues will focus on factors likely to improve the output of the pupils. No evidence was gathered in this study that directly hints at pupil gains. Only indirectly does data show that Educational Assistants are doing more work in small groups, more tutorial work, and more significant work this year An Educational Assistant's eagerness to become a teacher connected with what pupils have learned has not been demonstrated.

A recent study demonstrated that a focus upon outcomes and systematic instructional efforts could produce results that were as good from a "man-in-the-street" as a credentialed teacher. [15] The development of a series of models for teacher competence has focused many of the issues involved in the systematic instruction that currently lacks in many education and training programs.[16]

The critical studies of the influence of paraprofessionals on student achievement has high priority. One current study deserves continued attention. It seeks to study paraprofessionals in relation to twelve categories of teacher and paraprofessionals behavior closely associated with pupil cognitive growth.[17]

---

[14] Albert Shanker, "Where We Stand" Sunday, August 15, 1971, New York Times, Section E, page 11.

[15] W. James Popham, "Performance Test of Teaching Profiency: Rationale, Development and Validation," American Educational Research Journal Jan. 71 VIII, p. 105-117.

[16] Elementary Teacher Training Models: Nine Programs Models, US. H E W, U.S. Government Printing Office, FS 5, 258 58033.

[17] Brickell, Henry M. Paraprofessional Influence on Student Achievement and Paraprofessional Performance Outside the Classroom. Institute for Educational Development 1971.

The one exception to these observations was the basic skills pilot program used in one district. That pilot project demonstrated the possibilities of immediate upgrading of competence of participants. The gain scores among the Educational Assistants in the pilot program of basic skills are encouraging. The resistance to diagnostic testing needs to be taken into account by programs. The gains in vocabulary and spelling point to the possibility that reading programs for participants could produce similar increased competence. It is now widely accepted that business executives take adult reading courses to improve their reading pace and skills. Educational Assistants deserve as much or more. Any instructional systems approach would need to be tempered with consultation and individualized work with the participants. The inservice systems oriented training program for paraprofessionals in basic or reading skills in one thing, but it does not in the investigators opinion go far enough. What could be used is the same approach to the entire range of training -- training of trainers, and inservice training.

A fifth issue behind the issues is the critical need for a series of alternative approaches to product development, or systematic feedback. There is a lack of alternative evaluation models that will lead to the improvement of practice and the advancement of knowledge. In many instances today, practices have advanced far beyond theoretical conceptions, yet the tools for research are frequently not boldy contributing to the evaluation, but are rigidly carrying our some "raw" empirical measures that all too frequently are based upon oversimplified indicators of the tasks, events and activities. The improvement of practice many times seems less of a goal than perfecting the model for assessment. To state the issue here is not to blame, but to describe.

There is a need to recognize the requirements of Program Planning and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) on the one hand, and to use a pragmatic approach toward the "disjointed incrementalism" in policy formation on the other. There is a need for innovative educational proposals and systematic educational product development with evaluation and feedback tied to the improvement of practice. The relationship between such an overall development and evaluation of framework such programs as AECU and the paraprofessional programs call for many things. It calls for systems analysis and thinking through program benefits in terms of a series of objectives rather than just as proximate ones. This because without such a framework one may look only at the present results without looking at issues beyond or at unanticipated consequences of programs.

---

[18]Egon Guba "The Failure of Educational Evaluation" Educational Technology, 1969.

19 Stufflebean, Daniel, et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making Peacock Press. Itasca, Illinois. 1971

Conclusions

What are the conclusions of this study in the light of the findings and the issues? In bold terms, the findings tend to offer support for the existince of programs and services as claimed.

1. The data shows that there have been basic skills programs.

2. There is a mechanism and network for training of trainers and inservice training that provides the opportunity for staff development and feedback.

3. There exists a career ladder program with inservice training, work study and graded duties as a basic part.

4. There is a cadre of paraprofessionals who are moving toward central teaching status. Their performance in the classroom reflects increased responsibilities. Results show more time devoted to working in small groups and in tutorial in presenting information as well as commitment and determination toward becoming teachers.

5. The work-study component reveals more than satisfactory grades by the participants in the seminar and practicum of the community colleges.

Recommendations One: Strengthening Existing Mechanisms and Add New Ones

On the basis of findings and analysis of the issues, it is recommended not only that existing mechanisms be continued, but substantively strengthened and expanded. It is recommended that the career ladder program be continued; that the work-study elements be maintained; and that the training of trainer and the district inservice training be continued, but drastically strengthened. The details of these recommendations will follow. A final recommendation calls for the formation of a coalition of interested groups into a task force in behalf of the career ladder program.

Recommendation Two:

It is recommended that the Career Ladder be maintained. The career ladder approach was designed to overcome shortage of teachers and to provide another means to certification. It relates the job and education, the work and learning, responsibilities and curriculum content. It helps to meet the critical manpower shortage in one of the human services.

Since the career ladder constitutes one alternative, it is suggested that information about other alternatives ought to be considered, such as the external degree provided by the State of New York. Information about this option was provided by the State of New York. Information about this option was provided during the training of trainers' institutes by AECU. Consideration of this alternative ought to be studied by the Educational Assistants. If they get

the degree they won't need the career ladder!

Recommendation Three:

It is recommended that the work-study elements be maintained! There is some danger under the current fiscal crisis that with budget cuts in the career ladder program that Board of Education and Union contract agreements for 1971-72, would affect the work-study program. If there are severe limitations placed on the number of units one may take per year, some of the Educational Assistants may be old enough to be eligible for social security before they begin paying into the teachers' retirement system. There are instructional and curriculum changes needed. Senior colleges within City University of New York ought to anticipate changes in curriculum to become more relevant to the experiences of older students through the career ladder work-study program. In their case practice and experience become a springboard for analysis, theory, and learning.

Recommendation Four:

It is recommended that the District inservice training and the training of trainers be continued and drastically strengthened. The existing network with the district training teams ought to be preserved, but upgraded through a systematic appraoch to trainer training. A greater capacity of substantive instructional technology is needed. There is, at present, a lack of clear-cut performance criteria that provide for systematic evaluation, program development, and accountability.

In the opinion of this investigator, there appeared to be little overall systematic conception of the training of trainers. There is a major difference between scheduling consultants into the existing mechanism of District Trainers' meetings in workshops, institutes, and conferences, and the task of defining the actual substance and goals of instruction in terms of out-comes so that increasing competence may be developed.

The lack of clear overall systematic conception was evident in the inservice training clearly which exists without criteria for behavioral performance. It is not possible to determine the effectiveness of such a program. The lacuna is, in part, a need for new instructional and evaluation models. The present mechanism has the potential to deal with instruction training, and development issues, and to deal with problems that arise through feedback and recycling.

Recommendation Five: Formation of Task Force Coalition for Paraprofessionals

It is recommended that a Task Force be established consisting of an alliance of groups involved with auxiliary, paraprofessionals and new career programs. This coalition could bring together a number of levels and interest groups. The central purpose of the Task Force would be to review the short and long range issues of the paraprofessional programs and to make recommendations. The findings of this study indicated support for the existing program, but it calls for strengthening.

There are 15,000 paraprofessionals in New York City among the various programs, but only 750 are in the program involved in this evaluation. The range of issues that impinge upon the variety of programs affecting paraprofessionals is complex. If the state of affairs is left to each agency for each respective program, whether it be the Board of Education, Unions, the Human Resources Administration, or community senior colleges of City University of New York, then it is rather likely that the continuity of program will not be interrupted. Duplication and overlap of tasks will result and benefit the paraprofessionals and the benefits to society are not likely to result.

The need to add dimensions of leadership and to strengthen the approach to education and training go beyond the single unit of AECU of the New York City Board of Education. The challenge to leadership for substantive program development stands as a major problem. The independence of the Task Force and the obligation to make recommendations makes it important that the source of initiation be relatively free from agency special interest. A Task Force could be organized in a number of ways; suggested below are some alternatives to be considered.

The Task Force could be a Citizen's Committee. It could be initiated by the Mayor's Office, by the State of New York, by the National Committee on New Careers, or by some other private association. A series of interest groups that ought to be included are listed below with comments.

The Task Force could bring together those concerned with quality educational outcomes from the paraprofessional programs. The findings of this evaluation partially support the existing program, but call for its strengthening. The need to add dimensions of leadership in the approach to education and training go beyond that of AECU or the New York City Board of Education. There is the challenge of leadership for substantive program development that stands as one major problem. Some of the interest groups that might be included will be suggested below.

Key Interest Groups

1. Representatives from the District Training Teams and the Educational Assistance and Associates themselves should be a key group involved in any coalition. But such a coalition should not be limited to them. Joint training with teachers has yet to be fully implemented citywide. This alliance could be an important step. Some groups have attempted to help paraprofessionals organize.

2. The Board of Education, through its committee operation, could establish a Task Force or temporary structure to operate independently from the Board to make advisory recommendations. In this way recommendations on participation might come from interest groups who ordinarily do not participate on "Board-dominated committees." While AECU staff could be involved in such a committee, independence is important.

There is precedent for the establishment of an advisory committee to the Board of Education on career ladder program. The group should not be chaired by a Board of Education staff or paraprofessionals. It exists in the past. The need for an independent commission or task force is more important today than in

the past. The Chancellor of the New York City School System could reactivate or establish such a committee of individual citizens who are drawn from the variety of interested groups.

AECU, as an arm of the Board of Education of the City of New York, lacks the independence that would enable it to reflect the range of alternatives from the community districts and the full perspective of theory regarding systematic instructional and training.

3. Unions: District Council #37 and the UFT as the collective bargaining agent for the auxiliary personnel could assume greater responsibility for serving the program planning and funding interests of the Educational Assistants.

4. Universities and Colleges: The universities have traditionally provided sources of leadership for innovative programs. City University of New York is a federated system with each college having autonomy in curriculum matters. The Community College coordinators of paraprofessional training are operating extensive programs. The senior colleges have been preoccupied not only with this paraprofessional program, but with many others. (750 of 15,000) while the participants are fearful that they will not get full credit for transfer to the senior colleges, the CUNY has the task of providing some standard of acceptable pattern for senior college work among all the various senior colleges. Many of the leaders who are experts on National New Careers and auxiliary programs are found among the private universities in New York City.

5. The School District Coordinator for training, the Superintendents and Community School Board members, and School Principals have a role to play.

Some Districts have initiated innovative programs on their own. Many of these school districts have Bilingual paraprofessional programs, open education (open corridor) programs that require training not only for the paraprofessionals but the professionals as well. Title I Coordinators and others from districts have a vital role to play.

6. Private Agencies and Foundations: There are a series of private and semi-public centers in New York City that have programs in the past of special value to paraprofessional programs. These include such units as: Institute for Educational Development; Center for Urban Education; New Careers Training and Development (NYU); Bank Street College; Urban Education at Fordham University; Urban Center at Columbia University and others.

A series of issues for consideration for the Task Force are suggested below. There are many other issues among the various programs. This listing is merely illustrative of the types of concerns that may be considered.

1. What are the strategies to encourage a shift from an input focus to an outcome focus?

2. Consider the possibility that a competence-based system approach be combined with a group development approach to the inservice training of paraprofessionals and the training of trainers.

3. What are some of the ways to insure that performance criteria are specified for each phase of the training programs so that accountability of performance and results may be determined?

4. What are the ways in which new evaluation models may be included in program development planning?

5. How to require that evaluation of instructional outcomes from training programs be a part of program package.

6. That are alternative paths for becoming teachers -- regular four year college path; career ladder; career lattice; external degree; etc.?

7. What are the major alternatives available to paraprofessionals for the pursuit of college degree? And beyond? It would be of importance to consider regular college alternatives to the career ladder options in New York City Programs such as "University without Walls." The external degree, such as those provided through University of Rochester (SUNY) Empire State College or Union, considered experimental college or Goddard College.

8. How can further evaluation and research on the relative effects of paraprofessional programs upon children be encouraged?

9. What are alternative ways that to provide additional competence in basic skills for paraprofessionals?

10. Have the variety of sources for funding and have mixed sources for programs been considered?

11. What are the emerging major issues of the work-role relationships between teachers and paraprofessionals? There is sufficient data to warrant the examination of efficient and effective role differentiation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

REVISED TIME SCHEDULE FOR EVALUATION:

1970:

December	10	Prepared Final Evaluation Design	
	11	Met with Project Director AECU	
		Met with Director of Evaluation & Research	
	14	Met with Project Director & Assistant AECU	
			Observation

1971:

January	5	Met with Assistant Director AECU	
	7	Revised Evaluation Design	
	8	Reviewed Evaluation 1969-70 NYU	
	11	Attended Borough-wide Meeting of Training Coordinators in Bronx	and
	--	Met with Assistant Director AECU	
	--	Met with Community College Coordinator Bronx	
	18	Attended Borough-wide Meeting of Training Meeting of Training Coordinators in Manhattan	Data Gathering
	--	Met with Assistant Director AECU	
	--	Met with Borough of Manhattan Community College Coordinator	
	20	Revised Evaluation Design	
	21	Prepared Interim Report	
February	1	Queens Training Teams Meeting	
	8	Bronx Training Teams Meeting	
	--	Meeting with CUNY Coordinators	
	12	Interim Report	
	--	Pilot Test of Questionnaires	
	22	Attend Manhattan Training Teams	Data Collecting
	--	Revision of Questionnaires	
	--	Review of AECU Records	
	--	Visit with Paraprofessionals in Schools	
	--	Meeting with Selected Superintendents	
	--	Brooklyn Training Teams Meeting	
	--	Listing of Technical Assistance & Consultation of AECU	
	--	Interviews with Coordinator for CUNY	
	--	Interviews and Records from AECU	
	--	Training of Training Coordinators for Administration of Questionnaires to their staff and Paraprofessionals	
March	8	Bronx Training Team Meeting	
	--	Meeting with UFT representative	
	--	Brooklyn Training Team Meeting	
	12 or 15	Questionnaires to Training Coordinators of Bronx and Manhattan	Data Analysis

1971:

	--	Meeting with AECU Director	
	26	Questionnaires to Training Coordinators of Brooklyn and Queens	
	--	Questionnaires for Paraprofessionals in Manhattan, Bronx, Queens, and Brooklyn	
April	--	Meeting with Dean of Teacher Education CUNY	
	--	Manhattan Training Team Meeting	
	5	Meeting with UFT representative	
	3	Queens Training Team Meeting	
	--	Brooklyn Training Team Meeting	
	26	Manhattan Training Team Meeting	
May	--	Visit with Paraprofessionals in schools in Queens	Draft of
	3	Brooklyn Training Team Meeting	
	24	Manhattan Training Team Meeting	
June	14	Bronx Training Team Meeting	Final Report
July	6	Draft of Final Report	
	26	Draft of Final Report to Board for Review	
August	31	Final Report	Final Report

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF AUXILIARY EDUCATIONAL CAREER PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

Each year an evaluation of special programs is carried out. This year the evaluation of the career unit program calls for information from you about basic education, work-study college programs, the career ladder in operation, and other phases of the program.

Your answers to the questions raised in this questionnaire will enable the strong points and the weak points of the program to be estimated and modifications made in the program in the future. Your help is needed since you are a participant in some phase of the program. You can help to provide an accurate picture of the actual operation of the program and other reactions to it.

In addition to this questionnaire,the evaluation team has been conducting site visits, interviews, and gathering other information about the program. Your answers to this questionnaire will be confidential. No names or specific schools will be identified in the final report. An abstract of the final report will be made available to you if you are interested.

Please complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to District Training Coordinator.

AUXILIARY CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please check among the choices or fill-in blanks. Answer every question appropriate to your role. If the question is not applicable to your role in the program, print "NA" for "Not Applicable," and go on to the next question.

1. a. Check your role at the present time:
   _____Educational Assistant
   _____Educational Associate
   _____Auxiliary Trainer
   _____Teacher Aide
   _____District Coordinator Trainer
   _____Teacher

   _____ _____
   other

   b. How long have you been in the Career Program?
   _____ _____'67 _____'69
   _____'68 _____'70

   _____

2. Check the Borough where you work:
   _____Manhattan
   _____Queens
   _____Kings (Brooklyn)
   _____The Bronx
   _____Richmond (S.I.)

3. School District: _____ # _____

4. School P.S. _____ # _____

5. Grade level _____ # _____

6. It has been stated that there are three parts to the career program in Early Childhood Education for Teaching Assistants and Teaching Associates in New York City. From the list below, please check the three main parts or phases of the career program:

a) _____ Learning to do community work
b) _____ Attending college courses part-time
c) _____ Short term temporary jobs in schools
d) _____ Training while on-the-job
e) _____ Steps up in duties and pay
f) _____ One job, one salary step

7. List below those new duties and tasks that are being carried out this year by paraprofessionals as well as teachers and try to estimate how well they are being carried out.

Tasks & Duties	Improved	Same	Worse	Tasks & Duties	Improved	Same	Worse
_____				_____			
_____				_____			
_____				_____			

8. Some of the persons working in the Career Program are continuing to study and take courses in improving their skills in reading, writing and arithmetic in order to improve their ability to teach in these areas. Are you taking such basic skills courses? ____Yes ____No

If "yes" to #8, then where are you taking such course work?

_____ When did you begin?_____

Do you have a high school diploma? Yes___ No___
If "No," answer #9.

9. Some persons are taking an examination for a degree such as a High School Equivalence Diploma. Did you or do you expect to take such an examination?
____Yes ____No. If "yes" where_____ when_____

10. One of the series of courses in basic skills was presented to some of the career development participants in an AECU workshop or institute by Human Research Laboratory in the Fall of 1970? Do you recall attending this institute in your boroughwide meeting? ____Yes ____No.

11. If "yes" to #10, have you continued to take some of the instructional materials or exercises in basic skills or self-instruction that were provided by Human Research Laboratories (HRL)? ____Yes ____No

12. If "yes" to #11, what has been your reaction to the materials and to the HRL program? Check one below:

_____a) The materials and the program are excellent, have improved my skills a great deal, and are very helpful in teaching.
_____b) The program and materials are a good idea, but they vary from one skill to another in effectiveness and use in the classroom.
_____c) At first the purpose of the program was unclear, but now that we are in it, I am finding that it is of value, but it is too early to tell about results.
_____d) The program and the material is too complicated and does not deal with the problems of greatest priority from my viewpoint.
_____e) Neither the program nor material is of any use to me.

13. The help in basic skills has been provided by graduate students with specialization in reading, and other areas for some school Districts. Have you had some training services provided in your school or district from City University of New York? ____Yes ____No

14. If "yes" to #13, then pick <u>one</u> alternative that reflects your estimate:

_____a) The services provided by graduate students are of great help to us here, and we have found ways to use these services
_____b) The service is a good idea; it is helpful in some skills more so than others
_____c) It is too early to tell;the program and services are just getting started
_____d) The idea means well, but the graduate students have not been able to fit into the ongoing program in the schools yet
_____e) We have had the services long enough to realize that this is not what we need or want.

15. At recent Boroughwide meetings for trainers, sessions have been presented by AECU on basic skills for trainers. Did you attend such sessions? ____Yes ____No
If "yes," pick the one that nearest reflects your own view:

_____a) This was the information about techniques, skills, and principles that we need more of and can be put to immediate use
_____b) The information and principles were adequate, but the way to develop skills was not sufficient
_____c) The information was adequate, but it is too early to tell about its usefulness
_____d) The information was introductory and unrealistic given other priorities for time in training
_____e) The information was inadequate and irrelevant given the many other demans made upon our time.

TEACHING & LEARNING

16. In the carrying out of your job, as a result of the training program, would you say that you have found yourself and others believe that the training program:

_____a) definitely helped to make the job more satisying personally
_____b) helped to some extent to make the job more satisfying personnally
_____c) at times the training helped but results were uneven
_____d) the training program did not make any difference in making the job more personnally satisfying
_____e) at times it seemed to interfere with me getting satisfaction from the job.

17. Which of the following would you select as three major objectives of the Auxiliary Education Career Unit (AECU) program for training trainers for 1970-71?
Check <u>three</u> among the following:

____a) Lesson planning & Methods
____b) Role of Paraprofessional in School & Community Relations
____c) Dealing with Individualized instruction
____ d) Coordination of college/ school District
_____ e) Clarifying Agreements between Board of Ed and union

18. There has been a training program for the trainers; to what extent have you found the training of trainers program beneficial and useful?
Please check <u>one</u>:

____ A great extent ____ Some extent ___ Undecided

____ Slight extent ___ Not useful at all

19. Please check from the list below those items which were goals or aims of the inservice training program conducted within each school District:

___a) Interviewing skills and Intake Services
___b) General background of theory, child development, learning, classroom management
___c) Knowledge of testing children and interpretation of tests
___d) Teaching techniques, skill development, and problems arising from classroom situations
___e) Human relations concerns that arise in teaching situations
___f) Skills as community worker and outreach functions
___g) _____
other

20. One of the functions of the AECU is to share information about the various career programs and training. Please check from the list below those items you have received and rate the materials for their usefulness in your work:

Received			Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Undecided	Limited Use	Useless
Yes	No	Career Ladder Newsletter	++	+	?	-	--
Yes	No	Training Manual Auxiliary Career	++	+	?	-	--
Yes	No	_____ list other materials	++	+	?	-	--
Yes	No	_____ district materials	++	+	?	-	--

21. As you know, the AECU provides a number of services and carries out functions in this program; could you indicate by examples when you have contacted the AECU and for what services?

List examples of AECU services:

.Training Objectives, _____ _____
aterials, or Methods
.Regulations,agree- _____ _____
ents with Board and
nions _____ _____
. Personnel matters,
ligibility _____ _____
.Coordinate groups,
ervices _____ _____
.Other

The program in Work Study or attending college part-time is an important part of evaluation.

22. Are you attending college to take courses this year?
Yes_____ No_____ Which college?_____

23. If "yes," which course?_____

24. How many units or total credits have you taken by July 1971?
_____

25. When do you expect to complete the program at this college?_____

26. Which senior college do you expect to attend?_____
_____ When?_____

27. Could you give an example of a <u>pleasant</u> experience connected with the college course experience?_____
_____

_____

28. Could you give an example of an <u>unpleasant</u> experience connected with the college course experience?_____
_____

_____

29. Have you been able to schedule courses and release time in a way convient to you and your family?
Yes_____ No_____

Comment:

30. Would you give an example of how the college coordinators have been of help to you in this program?

31. Could you give an example of how District Coordinators have been of help in the college program this year?

32. Could you give an example of how AECU has been of help to you in the college program?

33. What do you look forward to in your remaining college work?

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF RELATIONSHIP WITH DISTRICTS

Borough Conferences

Bronx	7 Conferences
	Total Attendance-119
	Average Attendance-17
	Districts represented-7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
	100% of all districts.
Brooklyn	7 Conferences
	Total Attendance-126
	Average Attendance-19
	Districts represented-13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23
	100% of all districts with training teams.
	District 20-has only 1 school in the program
	District 22-has no schools in the program
Manhattan	7 Conferences
	Total Attendance-147
	Average Attendance-21
	Districts represented 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
	100% of all districts
Queens	7 Conferences
	Total Attendance-91
	Average Attendance-13
	Districts represented-24, 27, 28, 29, 30
	100% of all districts with paraprofessionals in the program.
Districts 25 and 26	have no paraprofessionals in the program.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Bowman, G. and Klopf, G.. New Careers and Roles in American Schools, New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1967.

Brickell, Henry M. "An In-Depth Study of Paraprofessionals in District Decentralized ESEA Title 1 and State Urban Education Programs in New York City Schools," New York: Institute for Educational Development, December, 1970.

_____. "Paraprofessional Influence on Student Achievement and Paraprofessional Performance Outside the Classroom," Interim Report, New York: Institute for Educational Development, March 5, 1971.

Guba, Egon. "The Failure of Educational Evaluation," Educational Technology, September, 1969.

Klopf, G., Bowman, G., and Joy, A. A Learning Team: Teacher and Auxiliary, New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1969.

Lindbloom, Charles. Policymaking Process, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Maguire, Ellen S. "Proposal for Change," New York Supervisor, Spring, 1971.

New York University Center for Research and School Services. "An Evaluation of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit Program," New York City Title 1 Project, School of Education, New York University, August, 1970.

_____. "An Evaluation of a Program for the Utilization of Educational Assistants in Selected Classes in Grade 3 in Special Service Schools," New York City Title 1 Project, School of Education, New York University, August, 1969.

_____. "Evaluation of the Auxiliary Educational Career Unit Program," New York City Title 1 Project, School of Education, New York University, October, 1969.

_____. "Evaluation of the Program for Recruitment, Training, and Employment of Auxiliary Non-Professional Neighborhood Personnel for Careers in New York City Schools," New York City Title 1 Project, School of Education, New York University, 1968.

Pearl, Arthur and Riessman, Frank. New Careers for the Poor, New York: Free Press, 1965.

Popham, W. James. "Performance Tests of Teaching Proficiency: Rationale, Development and Validation," American Educational Research Journal, Vol. VIII, January, 1971.

Riessman, Frank and Gartner, Alan. "Paraprofessionals' Effect on Children's Learning," Urban Review, Vol. IV, No. 2, October, 1969.

Shanker, Albert. "Where We Stand: Decentralization II," New York Times, August 15, 1971 (Section E, p. 11).

Stufflebeam, Daniel, et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Press, 1971.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "ELementary Teacher Training Models Nine Program Models," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, F S 5 258 58033.

AUXILIARY EDUCATIONAL CAREER UNIT

EVALUATION STAFF

Principal Investigator:	Stanley Soles, Ph.D.
Associate Investigator:	James Wortham
Research Assistant:	Paula Gertler